

HOW KENNEDY WAS KILLED

The full appalling story

JOACHIM JOESTEN

Published by
PETER DAWNAY LTD
in association with
TANDEM BOOKS

*First published by Peter Dawnay, Ltd.,
in association with Universal-Tandem
Publishing Co. Ltd., 1968*

First published March 1968

The author wishes to express his deep gratitude to his publisher Mr. Peter Dawnay, who has contributed a great deal of his own research, analysis and thoughtful interpretation to the making of this work. Seldom, indeed, have I met a publisher who has put so much of his own effort and so much genuine enthusiasm into the publication of any of my books.

Copyright © Joachim Joesten 1968

Printed in Holland
by Drukkerij 'Helmond' N.V., Helmond

CONTENTS

Foreword

Prologue

Chapter

1. When the Cops are the Culprits	14
2. The Minutemen	24
3. Caught in the Act	35
4. The Weird Case of Gordon Novel	43
5. Case History of a 'Psychotic' Oil Millionaire	53
6. Oswald, Ruby and 'Oswald'	64
7. Ruby's last Chance - 'The most fantastic Story you ever heard'	75
8. Whodunit	87
9. The Dealey Plaza Ambush	95
10. How Kennedy Was Lured into the Death Trap	111
11. What Garrison Has Up His Sleeve	119
12. Was Tippit the Man in the Window?	131
13. The Guilt of the Secret Service	144
14. Operation 'Overkill'	158
15. Covering up the Tracks	188

Appendix

Prologue

It is a pity that there is no Pulitzer prize for the newspaper that prints the silliest story of the year. If there were such a prize, *Die Welt*, Germany's 'most distinguished' newspaper,* would stand a good chance of winning the 1967 award.

In its issue of November 3, 1967, *Die Welt* gave frontpage display to a story entitled 'Another Dallas Virtually Impossible Now' which contained these gems:

'Could there be a repeat performance of the Dallas assassination?'

'Four years after the murder of U.S. President John F. Kennedy, this question most probably warrants a negative reply. For, since the Dallas shooting and the criticism which the Warren Commission addressed to President Kennedy's bodyguards, the U.S. Secret Service has been completely reorganized.

1 - The number of Secret Service agents and the annual budget have been doubled to about 650 persons and 17 million dollars.

2 - The Secret Service has been equipped with a computer that will provide data about potential assassins within five minutes, whereas previously the compilation of such data could take up to a week.

3 - Liaison between the FBI, the CIA and the Department of Defense has been substantially improved: The Secret Service now gets 6,000 to 7,000 items of information a month, as compared with only a few hundred a month in 1963.

4 - The list of potential presidential assassins has been expanded from about 100 to about 1,800..

* *Die Welt*, founded by the British Military Government in Hamburg after the downfall of the Nazi State, ranked for about a decade as Germany's leading newspaper; it lost much of its distinction after passing under the control of the 'press lord' Axel Springer.

It takes more than a normal degree of naïvety to believe, that the hazards of political assassination can be reduced, much less eliminated by such measures.

No computer in the world can fathom the dark recesses of the human soul where murderous impulses breed and develop. If there is anything the Kennedy assassination has conclusively shown, it is that the real danger to a president's life does not spring from irrational behaviour or common criminal intent but rather from the cold calculations of political foes bent on seizing power by fair means or foul.

The District Attorney of New Orleans, James Garrison, the only official in America who has yet mustered the courage to carry out a real investigation of the slaying of President Kennedy, has stated flatly that the purpose of the assassination was to change the foreign policy of the United States. He has also accused a handful of 'psychotic oil-rich millionaires' of having plotted this crime in co-operation with the paramilitary right (Minutemen and Neo-Nazis) and with the connivance of the Dallas police. (cf. page 24).

Let us suppose that the Secret Service's special computer was already functioning in 1963. Not even the most highly developed electronic brain can supply answers to questions that no one asks, or flash conclusions from premises that are being withheld. Does anyone sincerely believe the Secret Service chiefs in Washington, in 1963, would have fed their computer data about the hysterically anti-Kennedy oil millionaires who are found in numbers around Dallas, or about the heads of police in that fair city?

To ask that question is enough to reduce the whole proposition *ad absurdum*. All that talk about the supposedly magic power of a computer to detect assassination plans is just an integral part of the official cover-up of the Kennedy murder that began even before the president's heartbeat had stopped and goes on unabated to this day. It is just another one of the countless smokescreens that are being put up one after another these days in a last desperate attempt by officialdom and the mass media to hide the truth about the 'Crime of the Century'.

Needless to say, *Die Welt* didn't invent that computer,

even though its presentation of the story betrays either super-normal gullibility or bad faith. 'Informed sources' in Washington have been leaking dope stories about the reorganization of the Secret Service to the press for months, forever insisting that all that's needed to prevent a repetition of Dallas is more money, more men, more guns and more informers, plus a shiny new computer.

The *Washington Post*, house organ of the Johnson Administration, carried this story on July 18, 1967:

'The Secret Service is feeding a special computer the names and data on all known individuals, groups or organizations who might try to kill the President.

'One recommendation of the Warren Commission was that the Secret Service expand its list of potentially dangerous people. At the time of President Kennedy's assassination, a manual system was used to check up on dangerous individuals.'

'The service worked with the national Bureau of Standards and other agencies in developing the specialized equipment to handle 'protective intelligence'. It is supposed to be operating by Jan. 1.'

'In addition to the computer, the agency has taken other steps to help it spot potential assassins. Federal agencies, state and local police and investigative organizations are now required to furnish the Secret Service with any information they have on people who might want to kill the President.'

January 1, 1968 then should be a real red-letter day in the calendar. As from that date, presidential assassinations in the United States will no longer be practicable, thanks to the all-seeing eyes, all-hearing ears and all divining brain of the magic robot that will start functioning at Secret Service headquarters on that day.

That comfortable thought must have made L. B. Johnson feel a lot better as the bells were ringing in the New Year.

Poor Lyndon's head must have been lying uneasy of late. Just think of it: no less than 1,800 people are out to kill him, according to the revised official list, as compared with only a hundred who were harbouring murderous thoughts towards John F. Kennedy. And that little band made it, easily, at

Dallas on November 22, 1963.

But then of course they didn't have to reckon with a Secret Service computer.

Foreword

It is not always a satisfaction to be proved right.

I, for one, would certainly prefer to have been wrong in my earliest analysis of the true background of the Kennedy murder, for it did indeed reflect on the integrity of the American Establishment and bring to light an appalling 'State of the Union'.

Unfortunately, the picture of the assassination which I painted as early as June 1964, when my first book on the subject, *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* came out, has been not only vindicated, but further darkened by the disclosures since made, mainly by the District Attorney of New Orleans.

In his 'Introduction to the Warren Commission Report' (Bantam edition), Harrison E. Salisbury, Assistant Managing Editor of *The New York Times*, late in 1964 took note also of 'Joachim Joesten' an American citizen of German origin, who has published (both in Germany and the United States) a theory that the FBI, the CIA, the Army and oil millionaires conspired to take Mr. Kennedy's life.

Mr. Salisbury's description of my first book – which he carefully avoided mentioning by title – is both incomplete and inaccurate. I never included 'the Army' among the forces I held responsible for the murder of the President. I did give vent to suspicions about some retired Army generals affiliated with the extreme right who are fairly numerous in Texas, and especially in the Dallas area, but they certainly do not represent 'the Army'.

Mr. Salisbury, however, was quite right in saying that my 'theory' pre-supposed a conspiracy in which the CIA, the FBI and certain oil millionaires were implicated. Only he forgot to mention the Dallas Police which, from the first day, has headed my list of suspects.

As a matter of fact, I was the only one, among all the critics of the Warren Report – most of whom were not heard

from until about two years after my first book on the subject had been published — whose work was not purely negative (i.e. destructive of the official version), but constructive, pointing out specific leads towards the real culprits and the true facts of what really had happened at Dallas on November 22, 1963.

In particular, Mark Lane, Edward J. Epstein, Harold Weisberg, Sylvan Fox, Léo Sauvage and others all studiously refrained from indicting (at any rate openly) the *CIA* while I have attributed to it, in all of my books on the subject, a leading role which has been strikingly confirmed by the Garrison investigation.

The *CIA* has its tentacles everywhere, especially in the press. It is not surprising, therefore, that I should have been singled out (along with Thomas Buchanan, whose *Who Killed Kennedy?* has, however, a certain fictional quality) for the most vicious abuse from Establishment quarters. I was the top 'kook', the unabashed scavenger, the ghoul of ghouls and everything I had written on the subject was 'wild speculation'.

Ironically, one of the most recent attacks on me appeared in the February 1967 issue of *Playboy* magazine,* at the precise moment that the Garrison enquiry, which was to vindicate virtually everything I had written about the conspiracy to kill President Kennedy, first became publicly known. And when *Playboy*, a few months later (October 1967), published the most informative interview with Mr. Garrison that has ever appeared in print anywhere, it turned out that my 'wild speculations' were in fact understatements of the hard and terrible evidence gathered by investigators for the New Orleans District Attorney.

Another irony of the situation is that the first nearly complete presentation of the truth about the Kennedy murder should have appeared in *Playboy*, a magazine normally

* In that issue, the magazine published an interview with Mark Lane and used the occasion to take a slap at me: 'The first two books attacking the Commission, Thomas Buchanan's *Who Killed Kennedy?* and Joachim Joesten's *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* contained wild speculations that generally discredited them as serious criticism.'

dedicated to the gay side of life. The job which *The New York Times*, *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *New Republic* or *The Nation* should have performed, was finally done by the Bunny set, between pictures of alluring nudes and the latest gossip about the jet-set.

The disclosures made by Garrison in this interview will give pause to historians the world over, regardless of the outcome of the Clay Shaw trial which is due to begin in mid-March 1968.

So far, the Establishment has not succeeded in its frenzied attempt to block the further development of the Garrison enquiry and to prevent the Shaw trial from coming off. But I am sure — oh, here I go again, wildly speculating — that the people who so effectively, and in such diverse fashion, sealed the lips of Oswald, Tippit, Ruby and Ferrie, before any of them could go to trial, will leave no stone unturned to stop the Shaw trial as well. For they are truly desperate now.

Possibly Mr. Shaw will worry himself to death before March roars in like a lion. Possibly the courthouse in New Orleans will catch fire. Or Garrison will succumb to the stress and strain of driving too hard in pursuit of the truth. Or the Federal forces will take over the State of Louisiana because of the racial situation. Or the sky will fall down, or . . .

No matter what happens, the truth is in the record now. The picture of 'How President Kennedy was Killed' which the reader will find in the following pages could not be so detailed, or so complete, or so authenticated but for the wealth of new information Garrison has made public in the *Playboy* interview.

Thanks, *Playboy*, for a good job well done.

And more power to your Bunnies!

JOACHIM JOESTEN

November 1967

Chapter 1

When the Cops are the Culprits

'The police were in on the job. Either they ordered it to be done, or else they allowed it to be done. In any case, they're in on the job.'

This is the considered judgment of President Charles de Gaulle, one of the most knowledgeable statesmen of our time, about what really happened at Dallas on November 22, 1963.

De Gaulle's pungent remarks were made, of course, off the record – almost four years before they became publicly known. For this is the salient point of the amazing disclosure just made by the French historian Raymond Tournoux* concerning President de Gaulle's views on the assassination of President Kennedy: it was immediately upon his return from Washington, where he had attended the funeral of the slain president, in late 1963, that the French Chief of State, talking freely to an intimate, drew a picture of the Dallas events that was diametrically opposed to the official version – and to the subsequent Warren Report:

'What happened to Kennedy, almost happened to me. The assassination of the President of the United States at Dallas is the assassination that could have struck down the French Chief of State in 1960, 1961, 1962, in Algiers or here (in France).'

De Gaulle was referring to the many attempts that had been made on his own life,** especially by the militantly right-wing OAS (Secret Army Organization), in the last phase of the Algerian war.

'It looks like a cowboy and Indian story,' De Gaulle went on to say, 'but it's really only an OAS story. The police are in

cahoots with the ultras. In this case, the ultras are represented by the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society and all those secret extreme rightist associations.'

General de Gaulle, it has now been revealed, never for one moment believed the story of Lee Harvey Oswald, Kennedy's alleged killer. He expressed his scepticism, and his view of what really happened, in candid terms:

'They got hold of this Communist who wasn't really one, a nullity, a fanatic. He was just the man they needed – ideal for the accusation. A fable was created to make people believe that this guy had acted out of fanaticism and love for communism. It was designed to set off an anti-Communist witch hunt to divert attention . . .'

I have always prided myself on having been the first person to make a detailed case for the thesis that Oswald was nothing but a preordained scapegoat* who never killed anybody in Dallas and that he had been, moreover, a phony Red manipulated by cunning wirepullers, but now I must concede that De Gaulle beat me to it. For his remarks were made – or at least his impressions were gathered – before I even arrived in Dallas to conduct my private investigation.

De Gaulle also visualized the sequel. 'They' had planned to shoot Oswald on sight to prevent a trial, but things went wrong. Oswald got suspicious and took flight. A policeman was killed. There were witnesses. A trial became inevitable.

'A trial!' the general exclaimed. 'That would have been just too awful. Everybody would have talked. A lot of things would have been stirred up. So the police gets hold of an informer, someone they could do what they liked with. And this character kills the false assassin on the pretext of defending Kennedy's memory.'

This part of the official hoax seems to have really riled the normally sedate general, for at that point he abandons presidential French to lapse into argot:

'*De la rigolade!*' he exclaims and that expression is a lot stronger than the English 'What a laugh,' which seems to be,

* Cf. *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* by Joachim Joesten, Marzani & Munsell Inc., New York, June 1964; and The Merlin Press, London, January 1965.

* *La Tragédie du Général* by Raymond Tournoux, Editions Plon, Paris, 1967.

** A detailed account of these assassination attempts will be found in the book *De Gaulle and His Murderers* by Joachim Joesten, published in 1965 by Anthony Gibbs & Phillips, London, England.

however, the only way to translate it.

And then the French President, again remembering a few of the things he himself had been through, wound up his assessment of what really happened at Dallas with the devastating statement '*Tous les polices du monde se ressemblent dans les basses besognes.*' (Every police force in the world is alike when it comes to dirty work.)

What made General de Gaulle see so clearly, almost four years ago, what is only now beginning to come to light?

For one thing, the French Chief of State is endowed, as his whole career shows, with a perspicacity that is quite extraordinary. In insight, acumen and vision, essential ingredients of true statesmanship, he has always towered head and shoulders above his contemporaries and colleagues.

Still, it would probably be giving De Gaulle too much credit to suggest that his judgment in the case was based solely on unsubstantiated perception. The French run a pretty good intelligence service and it would hardly be an overstatement to say that, intelligence-wise, the President of the French Republic is nowadays the best-informed statesman in the world (with the possible exception of the Pope).

There will be those, to be sure, who will challenge De Gaulle's views in the matter by demanding that he make public the evidence on which they are based - something he obviously cannot do. As a matter of fact, his remarks about the Dallas tragedy were not intended for publication at all, though in the long run they could hardly have escaped that fate.

Jim Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans, however, whose views about the real background of the assassination coincide closely with those of President De Gaulle (and also with my own), is in a different position. He not only can but must produce conclusive proof of his charges and he, too, has incriminated the Dallas police. But the time when a public prosecutor is to present his evidence is not a matter of his discretion.

Garrison, it seems, is well aware of the underlying reason why he has been relentlessly goaded since the start of his enquiry, by federal officials and in the press, to reveal his

evidence. It is quite obviously a trap, the intention being to force Garrison to reveal in advance of the trial the testimony of the witnesses he intends to call. Not only would this be unjust to Clay Shaw but it would provide the defense with grounds for having the case thrown out of the court before the trial began. That Garrison is aware of this is clearly shown in a remarkable and informative interview published in *Playboy* magazine (October 1967).

His case must be allowed to stand or fall on its merits in court, but even in the highest judicial circles in the United States it does not seem that this fact is appreciated. Indeed, Chief Justice Earl Warren, whose motivation in the matter is obvious, told reporters in Tokyo, on September 4, 1967, that he had seen 'no new evidence' - including the data compiled by Garrison - that would refute the conclusions of the Warren Commission.

'I've seen absolutely nothing that conflicts with the report,' Warren said and he added, 'I've heard that he (Garrison) claims to have such information, but I haven't seen any. . .'

In keeping with the one-sided, adverse reporting that has been characteristic of the press's attitude toward the Garrison investigation from the start, this statement by Warren made world headlines, while the fitting reply which Garrison immediately made to it failed to get into print, except in a few isolated places.

Said Garrison in a prepared press release (as quoted by the New Orleans *States-Item* on September 5, 1967):

'... The chief justice says he sees no new evidence in the case. It should be kept in mind that as an attorney he knows that there is no evidence to see prior to trial. Why then does he make a statement which has no real meaning and which can only reflect discredit on a case which has yet to be tried? Obviously, he is performing a service. . .'

This is the crux of the matter. The evidence which Garrison says he has gathered, and which from all indications he really does possess, must be presented *in court* and it cannot be made public, in any form or shape, before the trial. We shall not see this evidence, then, until some time in February 1968, for, at the request of the defence, Judge Edward Haggerty jr. on

October 16, 1967, decided to put off for four months the trial of Clay Shaw which had originally been scheduled for October.

But if Garrison is prevented by this ruling from revealing his evidence before the case goes to trial in March, he is and has always been perfectly free to disclose what he has found out about the Kennedy assassination as long as there is no direct bearing on the Clay Shaw case. And some of the most sensational revelations he has yet made came on September 21 when he was in New York for the taping of a radio interview that was to be broadcast by a City station on September 26.

Although some of the things Garrison stated on this occasion were the stuff out of which normally banner headlines are made, the press hardly made any mention of them at all. But the District Attorney had more luck with the papers in his home town which, though scarcely less hostile to him than the rest of the press, at least give him the coverage due to a local boy, even a bad one. According to the New Orleans *Times-Picayune*, September 22, 1967, Garrison, 'during and after' this broadcast made three important new points. He declared (a) that the assassination of President Kennedy had been ordered and paid for by 'a handful of oil-rich psychotic millionaires'; (b) that 'elements of the Dallas police force were deeply involved' in the crime; and (c) that 'some members of the White Russian community in Dallas' had also played a part in the plot.

This wasn't exactly big news to me, for I had previously and consistently made all of these three points in all of my books, all of which - with the exception of *The Garrison Enquiry* - had been published by the time Garrison made these disclosures.

But there is one big difference. While all of my allegations were based on circumstantial evidence only, a district attorney, especially a conscientious one like Jim Garrison, is unlikely to make such grave charges without having secured incontrovertible and tangible evidence.

If Garrison's charge that 'elements' of the Dallas police department were 'deeply involved' in the assassination was

sensational *per se*, the almost clandestine procedure the district attorney had to employ in exploring the Dallas end of his case tell an even more sensational story. For, according to the *Times-Picayune*, 'Garrison said he could reveal the latest developments because his investigators were finished in Dallas and back in New Orleans. *He would have jeopardized their lives*, he said, if he had mentioned the involvements of the Dallas police while his men were still in Dallas. The investigation there ended some 10 days ago, he said.' (italics mine - J.J.)

Visualize this unheard-of situation. Investigators sent out by a district attorney who is conducting an official enquiry into the assassination of the President of the United States, cannot operate openly in the city where the Chief Executive was slain, for fear of their own lives. And where does the threat to their lives come from? From the police department!

What President De Gaulle has now been revealed to have grasped intuitively (or on the strength of secret information) as early as November 1963, and what Garrison disclosed in New York on September 21, 1967, strikingly confirms every one of the charges I levelled against the Dallas police, time and again, in each of my six published books on the subject. As early as 1964, I openly accused the then Chief of Police, Jesse Curry, of complicity in the slaying of the President. My principal reason for making this grave charge was, at the time, an ill-considered statement made by Curry at a press conference on November 23. Asked why he had radioed instructions to surround and search the Texas School Book Depository immediately after the fatal shot had been fired, Curry said *he could tell from the sound of the three shots that they had come from that building*.

Now, the topography of Dealey Plaza, the tremendous noise produced by the presidential motorcade and above all the position of Chief Curry's car, which had almost reached the railroad underpass when the shooting began, all absolutely rule out the exceptional feat Curry attributed to his hearing. And if he really couldn't tell from the sound where the shots had come from, then he must have had advance knowledge of where they would come from, in order to be able to send all his men to the Book Depository, to the exclusion of all other

conceivable localities.

Since then, the evidence of police involvement has been accumulating fast and furiously, thanks mainly to the labours of the Warren Commission. (If only the *conclusions* of that Commission had been on a par with, or at least in tune with its *findings*!)

Among the most telltale facts the Commission dug up - and then ignored - were these:

(1) From about 10 o'clock, on the morning of November 22, the area between the railroad yards and the rear of the Book Depository was closed to all traffic by order of the police - a normal and necessary precaution.

(2) But - in flagrant violation of this order, three automobiles entered this area during the twenty minutes prior to the arrival of the motorcade; they were observed by a railroad employee, Lee E. Bowers Jr., who was on duty in a railroad tower about 14 feet above the tracks, whence he could scan this entire area.

(3) According to the Warren Report, two of these three cars 'left without discharging any passengers' - the only possible inference being that the third did discharge passengers.

(4) Bowers testified before the Commission (which carefully kept this part of his testimony out of its report) that he saw two men standing near the fence of a parking lot in this area - a private parking lot, incidentally, that was used by the Dallas Sheriff's office! One of them was 'middle-aged' and 'fairly heavy-set,' Bowers reported, the other was 'about midtwenties in either a plaid shirt of plaid coat or jacket.' The two men were standing behind the fence 'within 10 or 15 feet of each other,' Bowers said and they were facing the Presidential motorcade as it approached. Neither man was dressed as a railroad employee or police officer.

(5) The two men were still there, by the fence, Bowers further testified, when the shots rang out. And, at that precise moment, the witness noticed something peculiar happening in that particular spot. Bowers never got around to telling the Commission what he saw because, at that crucial point, he was interrupted and then excused by Commission counsel,

but he later revealed in an interview with Mark Lane that he had seen a *flash of light* at that moment.

To Jim Garrison, or any other independent investigator, Bowers would have been a witness of incalculable value. The conspirators also understood that perfectly and so Bower's mouth was closed forever, on August 6, 1966, by one of those skilfully arranged traffic accidents which, along with artificially induced heart attacks, brain embolisms and even cancer have taken an exceptionally heavy toll of the Kennedy murder witnesses.

However, even without the help of Bowers, Garrison has been able to reconstruct what happened behind that fence and an adjoining stonewall and he has stated flatly, on a number of occasions, that he knows the identity of at least some of the snipers who fired at the President from that vantage point. I'll come back to that important point later but must anticipate on it here because it heavily incriminates the Dallas police. Since these snipers were operating out of a closed area, which was controlled by the police, and was, moreover, a Sheriff's parking lot, they cannot possibly have been there, or have remained undetected, without police connivance.

The guilt of the Dallas police is also readily apparent from a careful scrutiny of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the selection of the motorcade route and in particular the totally unwarranted inclusion of that car-slowng detour which put the Presidential limousine in an almost sitting duck position under a hail of bullets. And it wasn't just cross-fire, as I have always contended. Kennedy was fired at from almost every point of the compass.

I can't go again into all the details of this 'self-betraying detour' here, as I have fully examined it in several of my books*. The Warren Commission attempted in vain, with plenty of weasel words, to refute my claim that this detour affords proof of a well-organized ambush, one that simply could not have been executed as smoothly as it was without

* Cf. the first chapter of *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* and *Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord* (pp. 211-223)

police approval and protection. Needless to say, this police complicity existed only at the highest level of command, and the great mass of policemen in the area were totally unaware of the game and had no part in it.

Garrison has again confirmed my views on this matter in his interview with *Playboy*, mentioned above. He has apparently learnt that someone in the conspiracy was in a position to obtain from innocent business contacts in Dallas the route of the motorcade more than a month before the assassination.

And in the same context, Garrison also explicitly endorsed my oft-repeated contention that Oswald was deliberately planted in the Book Depository by the conspirators who 'knew this would place him on the scene and convince the world that a demented Marxist was the real assassin,' as Garrison puts it.

Ever since I first openly accused Curry, and his Chief of Homicide, J. Will Fritz, of having been directly implicated in the Kennedy murder, I have been waiting patiently to hear from these gentlemen, or at least one of them, through his lawyer, but alas, in vain.

I've been told that the reason Curry and Fritz haven't sued me for libel could be that they saw no point in trying to collect damages from an impecunious author or his far from well-heeled publishers. Although Marzani & Munsell, The Merlin Press and Peter Dawnay might not, indeed, offer good prospects for collecting (not to mention myself in this connection), my Swiss publisher is a very wealthy man and his publishing house is one of the biggest in the German-speaking area. I'm sure, Messrs. Curry and Fritz could have collected handsomely from them, but apparently they weren't eager to take their chances in court. Not in Zurich, anyway. And I'm sure they know why.

After having been frustrated in all preceding attempts, I really threw the book at Messrs. Curry, Fritz and (District Attorney) Wade in *Oswald: The Truth*. This book contains a 96-page section entitled 'The Case Against the Dallas Police' which, in 11 chapters, explicitly accuses the Dallas police chiefs of a large assortment of crimes, including in particular conspiracy to kill the President of the United States; aiding

and abetting the President's assassins; conspiracy to pervert the course of justice by framing an innocent man who they knew had not committed the crime; fabrication and suppression of material evidence; intimidation of witnesses; perjury etc. etc.

For even greater effect, my British publisher, Peter Dawnay, when announcing *Oswald: The Truth in The Book-seller*, organ of the British publishing trade, in a two-page spread, several months before publication, explicitly invited those named in the book to sue him, and me, for libel so that the case could at last be aired in a court of law.

So much impudence scared our English printer into withdrawing his bid and the book eventually had to be printed in Holland. It has been out now for several months and, again, nothing has happened.

If it is very disappointing for, believe me, there is nothing more frustrating in the world than not to be able to get a libel suit out of somebody you've called a murderer to his face. And a presidential murderer, to boot.

Chapter 2

The Minutemen

'The connecting link at every level of operation from the oil-rich sponsors of the assassination down to the Dallas police department through Jack Ruby and including anti-Castro adventurers at the operating level were Minutemen, Nazi-oriented. It was essentially a Nazi operation.'

This is again a textual quotation from one of the latest statements made by James Garrison, in New York on September 21, 1967, concerning the results of his Kennedy murder investigation.*

Perhaps it was a good thing that this statement got so little publicity. People quite simply would not have understood it, either in America or still less abroad. A De Gaulle, yes - but how many de Gaulles are there?

The Minutemen? A Nazi operation? But Oswald was a Communist, wasn't he? And the Warren Commission. . .

There are few people, even in America, who know who the Minutemen are, what they stand for, and how they operate.

The *original* Minutemen, of course, everybody knows about them. They were the heroes of the American Revolution. And every one of them must be turning in his grave every time some of their self-proclaimed emulators of today make news, as they do frequently. For it is always news of arms caches uncovered by the police, of bombings, killings, threats of violence and frame-ups.

The Minutemen are the most numerous, most heavily armed and equipped, and best-financed organization of the American paramilitary right which also includes - among countless other similar outfits - the American National Party and the American Nazi Party. Essentially, the Minutemen are the armed underground, specially trained for terrorist

* *The Times-Picayune*, September 22, 1967

action, of the ostensibly respectable John Birch Society. In the South, especially, close links exist between the Minutemen and the Ku Klux Klan.

Large caches of Minutemen arms, frequently stored on the California estates or Southern ranches of their affluent sponsors and commonly including heavy equipment like machine-guns, bazookas and armoured cars have been discovered over the years, at regular intervals, from Coast to Coast. The last-known major instance of this was the seizure by the New York police, on August 24, 1967, of a whole Minutemen arsenal in The Bronx which included, among other items, 250,000 cartridges, 18 sticks of dynamite, 102 detonators, boxes of black powder, 66 rifles and shotguns, one machine-gun and hand grenades. Only a few months earlier, on October 30, 1966, the New York police had uncovered, in a different part of the city, another arms depot of the Minutemen, comparable in size. At that time, sixteen members of the organization, including the 'national commander' of the Minutemen, Robert Bolivar De Pugh, were arrested, but most of them, De Pugh among them, were released again.

In connection with the latest arms seizure in New York, on August 24, a significant circumstance came to light. One of four Minutemen arrested on this occasion, a man named Peter Psyrals, who had acted as arms buyer of the group, had also placed some fake orders for arms and ammunition in the name of the Communist Party leader Gus Hall giving the address of *The Worker* for delivery.

This sort of thing is standard practice with the Minutemen and is in keeping with the scapegoat role assigned to the make-believe Communist Lee Harvey Oswald in the Kennedy assassination.

Even as this is being written, a UPI dispatch from New York, dated October 26, 1967, brings startling confirmation concerning the murderous intentions of The Minutemen and their unhesitating willingness to commit political assassination at the highest level:

'A nine-month investigation of the Minutemen brought charges yesterday that many of the rightist organisation's

members, if ordered, would assassinate Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey, New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and Chief Justice Earl Warren because they are "Communist sympathisers."

'State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, whose office conducted the probe, said a number of Minutemen testified that on orders from their superiors they would not hesitate to carry out assassination directives.

'A report submitted to Governor Rockefeller, who ordered the probe last January 3, declared: "The Minutemen are a potential threat to the peace and security of New York State and other states. Training, reading, thinking and living guns, bombs and violence they are actively preparing for a private war."

'Minutemen are prepared to fight "the conspiracy" they allege is fostered by our President, Vice-President, the U.S. Supreme Court, the governor of New York and its senators as well the Mayor of New York City.'

'Mr. Lefkowitz said the Minutemen were organized nationally and that new members are "constantly being recruited." He said guns and ammunition are being stocked by the organisation and "the quantity of such secreted materials can only be guessed."

'Hearings this year have been conducted in New York City, Syracuse, Albany, Utica, Rochester and Buffalo. More than 150 witnesses appeared and thousands of pages of testimony were taken and documents examined. Mr. Lefkowitz said the membership of the Minutemen includes *police-men*, servicemen, National Guardsmen . . . and persons employed in sensitive industries . . . in 33 countries of New York State and in at least 14 other states . . .'

In one of the grimmest ironies in history, President Kennedy, in his inaugural speech, in January 1961, actually paid tribute to the Minutemen. He said:

'We need a nation of Minutemen; citizens who are not only prepared to take up arms, but citizens who regard the preservation of freedom as a basic purpose of their life.'

Needless to say, Kennedy was thinking in terms of the 18th Century Minutemen, and not referring to De Pugh's men -

who less than three years later were going to take his life.

Garrison has, however, indicated, again in the *Playboy* interview, that on the control level of the operation were to be found people who could be described as neo-Nazi including a clique of defectors from the Minutemen, people who apparently found even that group 'too liberal'. He described the assassins as a group of fanatic anti-Communists who killed Kennedy because he was working for a reconciliation with Russia and Cuba.

Whom can Garrison have had in mind when he made this astonishing remark about a small clique that had defected from the Minutemen because they were considered 'too liberal' of all things?

In view of Garrison's repeated insistence on the 'Nazi' and 'neo-Nazi' aspects of the Kennedy assassination, the conclusion is warranted that the reference is to the 'American Nazi Party' whose 'Führer', until recently, was George Lincoln Rockwell.

Now, by a weird coincidence - if indeed it was a coincidence - Rockwell was murdered at the precise time when Garrison began talking about Nazi involvement in the case (he had not done so in any of his earlier pronouncements). On August 25, 1967, Rockwell was killed in a shopping-center car park in Arlington, Va. (where his home and party headquarters were located) by a bullet fired from an upper-story window by a high-powered rifle - much in the same manner as Kennedy is supposed to have been shot. Within an hour, the police picked up a suspect, John Patler, who used to play Goebbels, to Rockwell's Hitler, in the American Nazi Party. On October 16, Patler, a former marine, aged 27, was indicted for the murder; he has contended that he is innocent.

Under the circumstances, the possibility that Rockwell was directly involved in the Kennedy murder and was silenced when Garrison's men began to close in on his small but militant clique must be taken into account though it is of course too early to reach any definite conclusions. If Rockwell was involved, he would not be the first of the plotters to die a violent death, though he would have the distinction to be the first to fall victim to undisguised murder, - dis-

counting of course Oswald who, according to Garrison, was originally implicated in the plot, but took no part whatsoever in its execution.

To go back to the Minutemen, one of their most effective local units was operating in New Orleans. Prominent in it, at the time of the Kennedy murder, were two men named Guy Banister and Hugh Ward who were also business partners in a detective agency called 'Guy Banister Associates, Inc.'

Guy Banister, a former FBI official and onetime assistant superintendent of the New Orleans police department, had had a 'stormy' career, according to the New Orleans *States-Item* of May 5, 1967. After he had left police work officially, if not earlier, Banister was active for years as a top U.S. intelligence agent in the South and in Latin America. His spacious office, at 531 Lafayette Street, in New Orleans, served both as a rallying point for Minutemen, Cuban exiles and assorted right-wing and intelligence operatives and as an arms distribution centre for these elements. This has been brought out with dazzling clarity both by the Garrison investigation and through independent research by the local press.

'A close friend and adviser of Banister's told the *States-Item* the veteran FBI agent was a key liaison man for U.S. government-sponsored anti-Communist activities in Latin America,' the New Orleans paper reported (*loc.cit.*) and added:

"Guy participated in every important anti-Communist South and Central American revolution which came along while he had the office on Lafayette Street," the source reported.'

The paper also stated that Banister 'is believed to have worked in cooperation with a U.S. military intelligence office here.'

Jim Garrison made exactly the same point to the *Playboy* interviewer. Describing Banister as one of the most militant right-wing anti-Communists in New Orleans, he pointed out that his headquarters at 554 Camp Street was a clearing house for Cuban exile and paramilitary right-wing activities. It was a mail drop for the anti-Castro Cuban Democratic Revolu-

tionary front and was shown in police intelligence records to be 'legitimate in nature'.

He said that Banister had intimate ties with both the office of Naval Intelligence and the CIA and that he published virulent anti-Kennedy polemics.

Banister, according to Garrison, also had intimate connections with American Intelligence Agencies and was possessed of a fanatical urge to fight Communism in every country in Latin America. Both he and Ward were deeply involved with the anti-Castro exiles operating in New Orleans.

In its issue of April 25, 1967, the New Orleans *States-Item* gave some fascinating details about Banister's role as an arms supplier to anti-Castro Cuban elements. After relating the story of a big 1961 munitions theft in the New Orleans area in which David Ferrie and one Gordon Novel - another key figure in the Garrison probe - took a leading part,* the *States-Item* reported that the war materials were then transported to New Orleans and dropped in three spots - Ferrie's home, Novel's office building and the office of Guy Banister. The paper then went on to say:

'A friend of Banister's, a man whose word is considered reliable, told a reporter in New Orleans he saw 50 to 100 boxes of munitions in Banister's Lafayette st. office early in 1961 . . . (He) said he saw munitions in a storeroom office, in boxes marked with the name 'Schlumberger'.'**

'He says five or six of the boxes were open. Inside, he says, were rifle grenades, land mines and some "little missiles" of a kind he had never seen before. The friend said he remonstrated with Banister because "fooling with this kind of stuff could get you in trouble." He added:

'Banister said no, it was all right, that he had approval from somebody. He said the stuff would just be there overnight, that somebody was supposed to pick it up. He said a bunch of fellows connected with the Cuban deal asked to leave it

* For particulars about Gordon Novel and his connection with the Kennedy murder case, see my book *The Garrison Enquiry*. See also Chapter 4 of the present work.

** The explosives in question had been stolen from a bunker leased by the Schlumberger Well Services Co. of Houston, Texas.

there overnight.'

Those 'fellows connected with the Cuban deal' were David Ferrie, Gordon Novel and possibly one other major figure in the Garrison enquiry. The *States-Item* continued:

'The munitions, Novel says, were picked up and consolidated soon after the New Orleans drops. He says they eventually were taken by boat to Cuba for use in a diversionary operation staged in conjunction with the Bay of Pigs attack . . .'

The whole thing was, in the words of Gordon Novel (at a press conference in April 1967) 'a war materials pickup made at the direction of the CIA' and 'the most patriotic burglary in history.'

Why is Guy Banister so important to the Kennedy murder case, although he himself has not yet been linked to it by Garrison - publicly at any rate?

For at least two compelling reasons:

1. - Because David Ferrie, the real kingpin of the murder plot (on the operative level) was closely connected with Banister. Garrison has made it clear, again in the *Playboy* interview, that David Ferrie worked as a paid investigator for Banister and that the two men were closely acquainted. In 1962 and 1963 Ferrie was often to be found at 544 Camp Street and Garrison has a record of a number of mysterious long distance telephone calls which he made to Central America from Garrison's office.

2. - Because, even more importantly, Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged Communist, was in fact a stooge for the same forces for which Banister worked and even operated out of their headquarters in New Orleans!

This truly amazing fact came to light first when the New Orleans *States-Item* on May 5, 1967 ran this banner-lined frontpage story: OSWALD AGENT FOR CIA, DA WILL SEEK TO PROVE. Underneath, a subtitle (with pictures) read: Lee Harvey Oswald . . . David W. Ferrie . . . Guy Banister . . . Sergio Arcacha Smith: All linked to Central Intelligence Agency or anti-Castro activities.

The most eye-catching part of this pictorial layout, however, was a photograph, in the left-hand corner, of a massive

three-storey building standing on a street corner, with this caption:

'This weathered granite building at the corner of Camp and Lafayette sts. was spotlighted today by Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison's Kennedy death plot investigation. It was both the headquarters of right wing anti-Castro activities and the address Lee Harvey Oswald used on pamphlets he distributed here for the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The arrow at right points to entrance at 531 Lafayette, the arrow at left to 544 Camp.'

I have always held, and have set forth this view even in my first book on the Kennedy Murder Fraud, *Oswald: Assassin or fall Guy?* that Oswald's ostensible pro-Castro activities were only a sham and a cover for an action directed against the Castro government and directed by the CIA.

In this interview with *Playboy*, Garrison expressed exactly the same view. Oswald's political orientation, he made it clear, was extreme right-wing, and he pointed out that his contacts in Dallas and New Orleans (other than the CIA) were exclusively right-wing. Some of them were even neo-Nazis and Oswald would have been more at home with *Mein Kampf* than *Das Kapital*, he said.

That Oswald was never at home with *Das Kapital*, although he claimed to have studied Karl Marx as an adolescent, that he was in fact totally ignorant of the basic tenets and, in particular, of the language of genuine Marxists, was one of the points I had stressed, and documented, in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* - which did not prevent the august Warren Commission from rehashing the Dallas police line on that subject. But I must confess that I never suspected the extent to which the roles were reversed in Oswald's case. I always considered him just an undercover agent who pretended to be a Red, but the evidence developed by the Garrison enquiry tends to show that he was more than that - a right-wing activist, a Minuteman, perhaps even a Rockwellian Nazi.

Garrison has also endorsed my view that Oswald had acted in Russia as an agent for the CIA, and he claims that when, after his return from Russia, he went to New Orleans, he 'resumed' his friendship with David Ferrie, a man whom he

had met in his boyhood when he had joined the Civil Air Patrol Unit captained by Ferrie. Garrison maintains that Oswald kept up his contacts with the CIA the whole time that he was in New Orleans and promises to produce in court a witness (a former CIA courier) who came into contact with both Oswald and Ferrie when acting on official business.

Oswald, Ruby, Ferrie - they all were cogs in the huge CIA machinery; so were Banister, Ward, Novel, Arcacha Smith, Manuel Garcia Gonzalez; and, it can be added here without in any way prejudging his conspiracy case, so was Clay Shaw.

Garrison claims that Ferrie and Oswald were two of the organisers of the group of anti-Castro exiles and Minutemen who were trained at the guerilla camp in St. Tammany Parish in 1963 to assassinate Castro.

In order to get into Cuba, Oswald had to establish his public identity as a Marxist - that very phony identity which later was to become fatal to him when his associates decided to doublecross him and to use him as a fallguy rather than as an operative in Kennedy's assassination.

Incidentally, during the Dean Andrews perjury trial, a question posed by the defendant showed that the CIA-operated camp where Oswald, Ferrie and - as Garrison has put it - a 'mixed bag of Minutemen, Cuban exiles and other anti-Castro adventurers' trained, had a reputation all its own. At one point during the proceedings, Andrews asked Garrison if he recalled discussing with him an 'assassin's camp' across Lake Pontchartrain. Garrison replied he remembered discussing it but said it was not necessarily an 'assassin's camp'. This rather evasive answer suggests that the expression 'assassin's camp' did come up during his conversation with Andrews.

It is a fitting description, for the men who were training at that camp, under CIA supervision, were meant to assassinate Castro, but they were thrown off course in the summer of 1963 when President Kennedy ordered the place to be closed. The camp was raided by the FBI on July 31, 1963 and temporarily put out of commission after the Federal agents had carted all the guns and ammunition away. At that point, the frustrated inmates of the camp 'chose John Ken-

nedy as their new victim', as Garrison himself has put in.

As an undercover agent, Oswald was a flop, both in the Soviet Union and at home. The way he operated his one-man 'Fair Play for Cuba Committee' in New Orleans and the manner in which he produced and distributed his 'Hands off Cuba!' and 'Viva Castro!' handbills were grossly amateurish and self-betraying. I pointed this out in my first book on the subject published in 1964 and Garrison has confirmed everything that I wrote then. He revealed in *Playboy* that one of Oswald's helpers in the leaflet operation was a fanatic anti-Castro Cuban exile and that he has T.V. footage of a street incident in which he can be clearly identified. He has also spotted that the return address on these leaflets was in fact 544 Camp Street!

Not only did Oswald use (for a while) the same mail address as Banister Associates and the CIA-sponsored Cuban Democratic Revolutionary Front, headed by Sergio Arcacha Smith, but he was repeatedly seen in the building itself in the company of Banister, Ferrie and Arcacha Smith. Several witnesses are ready to testify in court to that effect.

Oswald, the Minuteman, trained by the CIA to assassinate Castro - that's a far cry indeed from Oswald, the Marxist, who assassinated Kennedy for no particular reason, the knowingly false image conjured up by the Dallas police and endorsed by the Warren Commission. This distortion of identity, in the case of the alleged assassin, is the first of the three pillars on which The Kennedy Murder Fraud was built. The second is the no less transparently false allegation that Oswald killed Kennedy, and Patrolman J. D. Tippit to boot (Garrison has stated flatly, on several occasions, that Oswald shot neither of them). And the third is the almost childish naïve assertion that there was no conspiracy, that Oswald did it all by himself.

Were Banister and Ward involved in the plot to kill President Kennedy as it was being hatched in New Orleans? It is unlikely that we shall ever know for they are both now dead. Banister had a heart attack in 1964 and Ward was killed when piloting a plane in Mexico in the same year. By a curious coincidence the passenger in that plane was the

Mayor of New Orleans, de Lesseps Morrison, who had introduced Clay Shaw to President Kennedy in 1963. Garrison is non-committal when asked if he sees anything sinister about their deaths but like everyone else who has studied the case he is aware that a remarkable number of witnesses have died unnatural deaths at inconvenient moments.

He knows for instance of the chart prepared by a London insurance firm which shows that the odds against 15 of these witnesses dying *natural* deaths within three years of the assassination would, if calculated on 22 November 1963, have been a hundred thousand million trillion to one.

'But I'm sure NBC will shortly discover that one of my investigators bribed the computer', Garrison wryly commented to the *Playboy* interviewer.

Chapter 3

Caught In the Act

When Oswald, on the afternoon of September 27, 1963, stepped out of the Cuban embassy in Mexico City, where he had attempted in vain to obtain a visa for Cuba, a secret eye was trained on him.

It was the searching eye of a hidden movie camera which the Central Intelligence Agency had installed in a building across the street from the embassy and which day in day out kept filming everyone entering or leaving the Cuban embassy.

The Warren Commission, having learned about this practice - which is quite normal in the spy trade - asked the *FBI* for the picture of Oswald taken on the steps of the embassy and the *FBI* passed on the request to the *CIA*. There, faces of high-placed officials went red for it was a request that they could not very well turn down.

The trouble was that not one of the pictures the hidden *CIA* camera had snapped showed Oswald *alone*. For he had been accompanied on this visit to the Cuban embassy by his *CIA*-assigned 'baby-sitter'. And if the Warren Commission were to include that photo of Oswald and his companion on the steps of the Cuban embassy among its exhibits, the cover of one of the *CIA*'s most valuable agents would have been 'blown' beyond repair. That wouldn't do at all, the *CIA* decided, and it sought to remedy the situation with a bit of its usual fakery. And they might have got away with it, if Garrison had not started looking into the matter. On May 6, 1967, he issued this statement:

When the Warren Commission asked for photographs of Oswald and his companion, the *CIA* presented the picture of a balding, stocky, middle-aged gentleman who obviously was neither Lee Oswald nor his companion.

'During their Warren Commission testimony,' he added, 'the director and deputy director of the *CIA* were very careful never to mention that they had produced the wrong picture.'

Garrison said the 'fake' photograph - Commission Exhibit 237 - 'is now immortalized in the Warren Report as "photograph of an Unidentified Man".'

(And it isn't the only piece of absurdity immortalized in the Warren Report either...)

Exhibit 237 is Volume XVI of the Warren Commission Report shows the picture of a husky man of middle age in an open-collared shirt. The index merely identifies the exhibit as 'Photograph of an unidentified Man'. There is no apparent relationship with the surrounding testimony and no further comment.

Garrison explained in his statement that the *CIA* produced a 'fake photograph' because 'one or both of those men was employed by an agency of the federal government (the *CIA*).'

He indicated to newsmen that his interest in the picture was focussed not on Oswald but on his companion whom he described as a burly Cuban, - a broad enough hint that the District Attorney knows the identity of this man.

On May 10, Judge Bernard J. Bagert, the senior judge of the State District Court in New Orleans, signed a subpoena, at Garrison's request, ordering Richard Helms, director of the Central Intelligence Agency to produce the 'true photograph' of Oswald and the Cuban on the embassy steps. The subpoena also directed Helms to appear in person before the New Orleans Grand Jury, the following week, to answer questions about the *CIA*'s 'investigation' of the Kennedy murder.

Helms and the *CIA* simply ignored both court orders and of course there was no judicial sequel. Everybody in the United States knows that the *CIA* is, to all practical purposes, above the law.

In the same context, Garrison for the first time openly took issue with the *CIA* as well as with the *FBI*. He told *States-Item* reporters on May 8 that both these federal agencies were deliberately withholding vital evidence concerning the assassination of President Kennedy. He also accused both agencies of having purposely duped the Warren Commission by flooding its members with a gush of irrelevant information in order to obscure the truth.

In spite of their detailed knowledge of what Oswald really was up to in New Orleans, and what kind of people his closest associates were, Garrison said, 'these agents have remained silent while none of Oswald's significant contacts were called before the Warren Commission. They remained silent while the men on the Warren Commission were presented an endless parade of trivia, from Oswald's grades in grammar school to a study of his hairs.'

Oswald's Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Garrison pointed out, was a *transparent sham* and his associates in New Orleans were in fact 'involved in a variety of revolutionary activities, ranging from planning guerrilla strikes to procuring ammunition for smuggling into Cuba. These activities, he charged, were carried out with the full knowledge and consent of both the *CIA* and the *FBI*.'

'Federal agents were in close proximity to and well aware of these activities,' Garrison declared. '*They would positively - not just probably - know of Oswald's total involvement with these individuals engaged in anti-Castro planning and operations.*'

The full extent of official deceit in the Oswald case is glaringly reflected in these forceful remarks by a responsible law-enforcement official. They leave no room for doubt that the *CIA* and the *FBI* connived with the Dallas police to create a totally false image of the young man they themselves had used as a tool for years and who in the end was to be callously thrown to the wolves, in order to shield Kennedy's real assassins.

Two days later, Garrison told reporters in his office lobby: 'Obviously what is happening is that the federal agents involved are taking the Fifth Amendment. This isn't going to stop our investigation. There is no way in the world they can stop it. All they can do is slow it down.'

This barb was aimed at no less a person than U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark who had just ordered *FBI* Special Agent Regis Kennedy not to obey a subpoena directing him to testify before the New Orleans Grand Jury. Garrison had wanted to question Agent Kennedy both with regard to Oswald and Ferrie. The *FBI* man, himself a frequent participant

in anti-Castro meetings, had 'investigated' Oswald's activities in New Orleans and had also taken part in the questioning of David Ferrie when the latter was briefly arrested three days after the assassination.

The implications of Clark's refusal to allow the agent to testify under oath are perfectly clear. He was afraid of what might come out in court about the real nature of Oswald's activities and Ferrie's involvement in the assassination.

When Garrison quite properly called this attitude 'taking the Fifth Amendment' he did not yet know that a few days later the director of the CIA, Helms, was also going to 'take the Fifth' like any common criminal in order to escape embarrassing questions by a grand jury.

After Garrison had realized that Oswald, far from being a Marxist, was in fact a right-winger employed by the CIA, he set out to explore this intriguing angle further. To this end, he dispatched to Washington one of his special investigators, Tom Bethell, a former London schoolteacher (who had originally come to New Orleans to study the city's traditional jazz but had then found the Garrison probe more fascinating), for additional research in the National Archives.

Mr. Bethell went about this task with zest and a fine-tooth comb. His report to Garrison, parts of which were revealed in the local press early in July* sheds a great deal of new light on the extremely close - and well-guarded - relationship between Oswald and the CIA.

In his report, Mr. Bethell said the Central Intelligence Agency had concealed at least 51 official documents pertaining to Oswald, Ruby and other aspects vital to an investigation of the Kennedy murder. He also said it could be gathered from the list of hidden information that the CIA knew 'a great deal' about Oswald before the assassination.

'There are 1,555 Commission documents listed in the archives,' Bethell reported back. 'Of these, only about 1,200 are unclassified and available to the public.'

According to Bethell, some of the classified documents are

labeled 'S' for 'Secret' and 'TS' for 'Top Secret', but he does not know what the difference might be. He pointed out, however, that there must be some degree of secrecy to all the classified documents since they remain unavailable to the public.

Among the classified documents, Bethell felt, 29 would be of special interest to Garrison because their titles indicated that vital information was being withheld from his investigators. Here is a list of these titles, each preceded by its Commission document number and followed by its classification mark:

- CD 931: Oswald's access to information about U-2 (S)
- CD 1054: Information on Jack Ruby and associates (S)
- CD 674: Information given to the Secret Service but not yet given to the Warren Commission (S)
- CD 871: Photos of Oswald
- CD 321: Chronology of Oswald in USSR (S)
- CD 680: Appendix to CD 321 (S)
- CD 691: Appendix A to CD 321
- CD 818: Revisions of CD 321 (S)
- CD 692: Reproduction of official CIA dossier on Oswald
- CD 1216: Memo from Helms (CIA Director Richard Helms) entitled 'Lee Harvey Oswald' (S)
- CD 935: Role of Cuban Intelligence Service in processing visa application (TS)
- CD 1273: Memo from Helms re apparent inconsistencies in information provided by CIA (S)
- CD 1551: Conversations between Cuban president and ambassador (TS)
- CD 347: Activity of Oswald in Mexico City (S)
- CD 384: Activity of Oswald in Mexico City
- CD 528: Re allegations Oswald interviewed by CIA in Mexico City
- CD 426: Interrogation of Sylvia Duran in Mexico City
- CD 1000: Mexican interrogation of Gilberto Alvaredo (S)
- CD 1287: Re Oswald and affidavit concerning cropped picture (S)
- CD 698: Reports of travel and activities of Oswald and Marina

* Cf. *The New Orleans States-Item*, July 1, 1967, and *The Times Picayune*, July 2.

- CD 631: Re CIA dissemination of information on Oswald
- CD 708: Reply to questions posed by State Department
- CD 1012: George and Jeanne De Mohrenschildt (S)
- CD 1222: Statements of George De Mohrenschildt re assassination (S)
- CD 943: Allegations of PFC Eugene Dinkin re assassination plot (S)
- CD: 971: Telephone calls to U.S. Embassy, Canberra, Australia, re planned Assassination (S)
- CD 1089: Letter re assassination sent to Costa Rican embassy (S)
- CD 1041: Allegations regarding Intelligence Training School in Minsk (USSR) (S)

One could hardly think of a more telltale title (on a secret document) than 'Oswald's access to information about the U-2.' The U-2, of course, is America's top secret spy plane which was performing high-altitude reconnaissance missions over Soviet territory at the time Oswald, a trained radar technician, 'defected' to that country. The whole story of Oswald's real nature and his real reasons for going to the Soviet Union is revealed by that title.

Nobody had ever heard before of a Private First Class Eugene Dinkin or that he had, or professed to have, information about an assassination *plot*. But since the Warren Commission had his name in its file and knew that he wanted to, or could, give evidence about a plot to assassinate the President, it obviously would have been its duty to call on him to testify. Either this is another case of dereliction of duty by the Warren Commission, or else the PFC was no longer available as a witness. Maybe the conspirators saw to it that his mouth was sealed promptly - as they did in 23-odd other cases - after it had become known that he had a story to tell.

Could it be that Dinkin was one of the 'mixed bag' of guerrilla fighters the CIA had been training at the 'assassin's camp' north of Lake Pontchartrain?

And what about those mysterious phone calls to the U.S. Embassy in Canberra about a *planned* assassination? Who was that unhappily well-informed caller, what did he report

and what was done with the information he provided. Nobody in our generation will ever know, for the Warren Commission failed to explore the matter and now the story is buried in the classified section of the National Archives for the next 75 years.

Apart from these intriguing - and in themselves revealing - titles of classified documents, Mr. Bethel came back with an equally telltale paragraph from one of the unclassified Commission papers. This was a notarized statement by a State Department official named James D. Crowley which read:

'The first time I remember learning of Oswald's existence was when I received copies of a telegraphic message, dated *October 10, 1963*, from the Central Intelligence Agency, which contained information pertaining to his current activities.'

Bethel, in his memorandum to Garrison, added:

'The contents of this message apparently did not reach the Warren Commission because there are no commission documents originating from the CIA dated prior to the assassination, so we cannot request this information by document number, but it would be interesting to know what the CIA knew about Oswald six weeks before the assassination.'

It would be, and it might indeed be useful to a District Attorney investigating the assassination of a President of the United States. But even though he is acting in the exercise of his official duties, Garrison has no more access to these classified documents than anybody else. Of course, one word from the Washington Government would be sufficient to open up all the dark recesses of the National Archives to Garrison's investigators, but that word is not likely ever to be forthcoming, not as long as the Johnson Administration lasts, anyway. For that Administration is desperately afraid of the truth.

Garrison has used some strong words to castigate the CIA, the FBI and the federal government for trying to hamstring and sabotage his investigation by fair means or foul, but nothing he has said really overshoots the mark. Take for instance this statement:*

* *New Orleans States-Item*, May 8, 1967.

'The federal agents who concealed vital knowledge regarding President Kennedy's assassination, and their superiors who are now engaged in a dedicated effort to discredit and obstruct the gathering of evidence in the case, are guilty of being accessories after the fact to one of the cruellest murders in our history.'

Grave as this accusation against the federal authorities is, it represents no more than a simple statement of fact, couched in legal terms. When the time comes - and it surely will come before very long - for calling to account all those, no matter how high-placed now, who have effectively shielded Kennedy's assassins by using all their influence to prevent the truth from coming out, it will be interesting to watch the procession of 'accessories after the fact' through the courtrooms, especially in Washington.

Specifically, Garrison, in his television interview in New Orleans on May 21, 1967, accused the CIA of 'essentially criminal activities by making every possible effort to block our investigation.'

Without mincing his words, Garrison stated:

'And if the director of the CIA and the top officials of the CIA were in the jurisdiction of Louisiana, I would charge them without hesitation.'

He went on to confirm explicitly that it was Richard Helms he had in mind 'because he has to know what he's doing. . .'

The situation is without precedent in modern history:

A ranking member of the Cabinet, director of the nation's intelligence system, stands openly accused by a public prosecutor of 'criminal activities' and of being an accessory after the fact in the murder of the Chief of State!

Chapter 4

The Weird Case of Gordon Novel

One name that will be remembered for years to come whenever the death of President Kennedy is discussed, is that of Gordon Novel, the talkative CIA man. He may become more famous than Lee Harvey Oswald, and for a much better reason. For, while Oswald was only a small cog in a huge machine, and not an assassin at all, Novel played a big role in the conspiracy. For that reason alone, the Warren Commission made sure that it missed him completely, as it did.

Some of the antics and adventures of Gordon Novel, a 29-year-old bar operator, electronics expert and self-admitted CIA operative in New Orleans, have already been described in *The Garrison Enquiry* (Chapters 6 and 7). Since then, more of his exploits have come to light, partly through statements made by Garrison in his *Playboy* interview, partly as an outgrowth of legal manoeuvring that developed out of Garrison's attempts to get the fugitive from justice back to New Orleans.

Jim Garrison and Gordon Novel have been playing, from the start, a curious cat-and-mouse game. After Garrison had found out that Novel was a great pal of David Ferrie's and was also another CIA-man deeply involved with the Cuban exiles in the New Orleans area who actively participated in the plot to murder the President, he at first tried the indirect approach. He invited Novel to his office in his quality as an electronics expert and told him, without otherwise giving the show away, that his office had been 'bugged' (by the FBI).

Could Novel be of help in removing these 'bugs'?

Novel, apparently, was of some help and kept in touch.

Before long, however, Novel realized that Garrison's interest in him was not purely electronic. He sought and found reinsurances with the National Broadcasting Company (NBC).

Indeed, Novel himself has publicly stated* that as early as

* See *The Garrison Enquiry* p. 89.

February 1, 1967 - i.e. more than two weeks before the Garrison investigation became a matter of public knowledge - he was hired as a consultant by *NBC* and for the next two months contributed inside information and material to the programme attacking Garrison, which the network put on the air in June.

Who tipped off *NBC* to what was brewing in New Orleans, at a time even the local press was unaware of it, if it wasn't Gordon Novel? It doesn't matter if he did so directly or through his *CIA* contacts. At any rate he was the original source.

Novel later claimed - as did several others in the game - that Garrison had just picked on him as a potential false witness - a charge absurd on the face of it although it was taken up by the so called news media. He cited this alleged pressure as the reason he decided, in mid-March, to shake the New Orleans dust off his feet:

'He (Garrison) could probably get me if he put enough pressure on me, if he had me in his pocket the way he has a lot of other people.'

After Novel had fled from New Orleans, dodging a subpoena to appear before the Grand Jury investigating the Kennedy assassination, the city police and Garrison's investigators thoroughly combed his apartment for traces of evidence he might have left behind. They searched in vain. Novel appeared to have covered his tracks as expertly as one might expect from a *CIA* operative.

A few weeks later, however, a real windfall fell into Garrison's lap, in an almost farcical manner. Two young girls who had moved into the empty apartment decided it needed a thorough springcleaning and went about it with female efficiency. They weren't concerned with anything but dirt, but what they found was pure gold - the stuff a District Attorney's dreams are made of.

Under a strip of linoleum on the kitchen-sink draining-board, the girls found a pencilled rough draft of a letter. It didn't mean much to them, but Novel, by that time, had achieved a certain reputation in town and so the letter was turned over to the boyfriend of one of the young ladies, a student at Tulane University. He in turn passed it on to one of

his professors who showed the letter to Hoke May, a reporter on the *States-Item* who had been covering the investigation.

Mr. May took one glance at what he had in hand and then rushed the document to a handwriting expert, Gilbert Fortier, for comparison with other samples of Novel's writings. Mr. Fortier determined that the draft had been written by Novel, a fact subsequently confirmed by one of Novel's attorneys who even added, rather curiously, that 'everything in the letter as far as Novel is concerned is actually the truth.'

What was in the letter was nothing less than a bombshell. Addressed to a Mr. Weiss, who, the circumstances clearly indicate, was Novel's superior in the *CIA*, the letter read:

'I took the liberty of writing you direct and apprising you of current situation expecting you to forward this through appropriate channels. Our connection and activity of that period involved individuals presently about to be indicted as conspirators in Mr. Garrison's investigation.'

This is an unmistakable reference to Messrs. Ferrie and Shaw and suggests that the letter may have been written in late February, shortly before Ferrie's death.*

Novel then went on to write, a little further on:

'Mr. Garrison... is unaware of Double-Chek's involvement in this matter but has strong suspicions.'

Double-Chek! That was the jackpot. Garrison, a well-read man with a strong (and fully justified) dislike for the Central Intelligence Agency, immediately understood the significance of 'Double-Chek's' involvement with Gordon Novel and, by the same token, with the Kennedy assassination.

In their book *The Invisible Government*, published in 1964, David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, two well-informed Washington correspondents, have exposed the Double-Check Corporation of Miami, Florida, as an all-out *CIA* front which played an important part in the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt.

First, *The Invisible Government*, a veritable guide through the *CIA* labyrinth, gave these details about 'Double-Check': the outfit is located in a 'small two-storey building on a quiet, palm-lined street in Miami Springs, Florida, not far to the

* See *The Garrison Enquiry*, Chapter 3.

north of Miami International Airport. It was, the sign out front proclaimed, the law office of Alex E. Carlson.

'Carlson, a big, blond, heavy-set man, towering well over six feet, saw three years of combat during World War II. . . After the war he got his bachelor's degree in Spanish at the University of Michigan. . . (Later) he returned to Miami and set up practice in Miami Springs. Most of his clients appeared to be obscure airline and air-cargo firms operating out of Miami International Airport.

'But Carlson's most intriguing business activity was the Double-Check Corporation. According to the records of the Florida Secretary of State at Tallahassee this firm was incorporated on May 14, 1959, and "brokerage is the general nature of business engaged in."

"The officers of the Double-Check Corporation, as of 1963, were listed as: "Alex E. Carlson, President, 145 Curtiss Parkway, Miami Springs" (the address of Carlson's law office); "Earl Sanders, Vice-President, same address; Margery Carlson, Secretary-Treasurer, same address." The "resident agent" was listed as "Wesley R. Pillsbury", at the same address.'

The authors then go on to describe in ample detail what Double-Check's real business was. The company was used by the CIA for recruiting American pilots to fly missions in the Bay of Pigs invasion, in which many of them were killed. After their deaths, the widows were regularly provided for with checks issued by a Miami Springs bank and signed by Carlson on behalf of an unidentified donor, represented by Double-Check Corporation.

The evidence compiled by Messrs. Wise and Ross is incontrovertible and accepted as such by Garrison. Double-Check was, and still is, as the Novel case shows, a front organization for the CIA. And therefore Novel's candid acknowledgement that the company was 'involved' in the case being investigated by the District Attorney is doubly significant. Even more so if one keeps in mind that Miami also figures in the assassination story in other ways.*

* Cf. the chapter 'The Guilt of the Secret Service' and Chapter 35 of *Oswald: The Truth*.

In his letter, Novel continues: 'I have been questioned extensively by local *FBI* recently as to whether or not I was involved with Double-Check's *parent holding corporation*. . . My reply on five queries was negative. Bureau (the *FBI*) unaware of Double-Check association in this matter.'

As a *CIA* agent Novel was of course duty-bound to deny, even under questioning by the *FBI*, that he was involved with the 'parent holding corporation' of Double-Check Corporation, an almost ludicrously transparent cover name for the Central Intelligence Agency itself.

Gordon Novel, when he penned this letter, was obviously filled with well-founded misgivings and not a little worried about his own safety.

'We have temporarily avoided one subpoena not to reveal Double-Check activities. . . We want out of this thing before Thursday, 3-67. Our attorneys have been told to expect another subpoena to appear and testify on this matter. The Fifth Amendment and/or immunity and legal tactics will not suffice.'

An interesting admission, indeed. Novel realizes that 'taking the Fifth' when queried about his involvement in the assassination of the President might not be a wise step. But, what kind of 'immunity' did he have in mind, one wonders. True, *CIA* agents are often virtually immune when haled into court, as ample experience shows. It seems to have occurred to Novel, though, that no court would be ready to grant immunity even to a *CIA* agent if he could be proved to have been plotting the murder of the Chief Executive.

One possible way out of this plight is referred to by Novel in these terms: 'appropriate counteraction relative to Garrison's inquisition concerning us' should be taken, he urges his *CIA* contact, 'through military channels, vis-à-vis the *DIA* man'. This seemingly obscure suggestion refers to the 'Defense Intelligence Agency' a super-secret branch of 'The Invisible Government' established in October 1961. Headed by top military men, the *DIA* is supposed to supervise *CIA* activities, among other things. In fact, it frequently steps in when strong measures are required to get the *CIA* out of a tough spot. Novel's appeal for help 'through military channels' and by the

DIA would seem to epitomize a feeling that must have long been prevalent in Washington: Why not send the US Army into Louisiana to stop the Garrison 'inquisition' before it gets out of hand?

But then the States-Righters might protest as a matter of principle, and they have some pretty powerful voices in Congress. . .

To his barely concealed ultimatum 'We want out of this thing before . . .' Novel added an even less veiled threat:

'Our attorneys and others are in possession of complete sealed files containing all information concerning this matter. In the event of our sudden departure, either accidental or otherwise, they are instructed to simultaneously release same for public scrutiny in different areas.'

This can only mean that Novel knows (or claims to know) the full and true story of the assassination and has deposited an account of it, in multiple copies, in various places for safe-keeping. Under the circumstances, the above-cited remark by one of his attorneys that 'everything in the letter as far as Novel is concerned is actually the truth' can only be interpreted as confirmation, by the lawyer in question, that he does indeed have in his possession, or under his control, a copy of this explosive material.

In this context, the shooting incident in which Novel claims to have been involved on May 22, 1967* appears in a new and possibly different light. Since the 'victim' survived the attack (which would be most unlikely if the CIA were really gunning for him), it may well have been a hoax set up by Novel himself (as Garrison thinks) in order to emphasize his warning and keep his bosses on edge.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government has been leaning over backward trying to protect Novel from Garrison's inquisitors. When the New Orleans District Attorney, acting through the office of Governor John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, requested Novel's extradition by the State of Ohio, where the fugitive had settled (and where he had been tem-

porarily arrested), Governor James A. Rhodes of Ohio refused to comply on the grounds that the extradition demand was legally deficient. Actually, the Governor was reluctant to send Novel back to New Orleans because he was only too well aware of the dim view taken of the Garrison probe by top Government officials in Washington. In Garrison's own words:*

'The reason we were unable to obtain Novel's extradition from Ohio - the reason we are unable to extradite anyone connected with this case - is that there are powerful forces in Washington who find it imperative to conceal from the American public the truth about the assassination. And as a result, terrific pressure has been brought to bear on the governors of the states involved to prevent them from signing the extradition papers and returning the defendants to stand trial. I'm sorry to say that in every case, these Jello-spined governors have caved in and 'played the game' Washington's way...

'Whatever his motivation, Governor Rhodes of Ohio, to name one, has said that he would allow me to extradite Novel to stand trial on charges arising from the CIA-inspired burglary of the ammunitions bunker in Houma, Louisiana** but that I would not be allowed under the stipulations of the extradition agreement to question him about the assassination!

'In other words, it's OK for me to send a man to jail on a burglary rap, but I mustn't upset him by inquiring if he killed the President. I'm all in favor of protecting a defendant's civil rights, but this is straight out of *Alice in Wonderland*.'

Garrison then tried a different tack. As has been related in *The Garrison Enquiry*, Gordon Novel in May 1967, filed a \$ 60 million damage suit against Garrison and his 50 sponsors in 'Truth or Consequences,' alleging that he had been persecuted on trumped-up charges.

In a shrewd counter-move, Garrison then filed, through his attorney, a motion for a deposition to be taken from Novel in the matter. This meant, in effect, that Novel, in order to press

* For particulars, see *The Garrison Enquiry*, p. 90

* *Playboy*, loc cit.

** Cf. *The Garrison Enquiry*, pp. 76-78.

his damage suit in the only jurisdiction available to him for that purpose, the New Orleans Civil Court, would have to return home to the city where he could be arrested for questioning in the conspiracy case. He preferred to stay put in Ohio. Garrison's comment:

'Rather than come down to New Orleans and face the music, Novel dropped his suit and sacrificed a possible \$ 60,000,000 judgment. Now, there's a man of principle; he knows there are some things more important than money.'

By midyear 1967, it looked as though Garrison and Novel had fought each other to a draw. The New Orleans District Attorney was unable to obtain Novel's extradition from Ohio. With Governor Rhodes refusing to sign the extradition papers, Judge William Gillie of Columbus (Ohio) Municipal Court, on July 3, 1967, ruled that he had no choice but to dismiss the case against Novel pending in his jurisdiction.

The same day, Novel's attorney in Columbus, Jerry Weiner, announced that he would return Novel to New Orleans for questioning without extradition if Garrison agreed to three conditions:

- (a) That Garrison drop charges pending against Novel;
- (b) That Novel be granted immunity from arrest if he returns; and
- (c) That Novel be questioned *at an open session* of the Orleans Parish Grand Jury.

The principal catch was in this last stipulation. It was bound to set the *CIA* on edge more than ever. For, if Novel ever talked in open court about his ample experiences as an intelligence agent, all hell might break loose.

Indeed, Novel, according to a story first published on June 14, 1967, in the New Orleans *States-Item*, had already let it be known that, *if he were granted immunity from the assassination investigation*, he would be willing to testify on a number of points, including

'... international fraud, mysterious intelligence activities from November 1959 to date in the Southern quadrant of the U.S.A. and certain islands off Florida, seditious treason, hot war games and cold munitions transfers, ten 1950-model

Canadian surplus Vampire jet supporter fighter aircraft and certain Cuban-Anglo-French sabotage affairs of early 1961.'

A fascinating catalogue of intelligence mischief, couched in the vaguest possible terms. How could Garrison have resisted the temptation to learn the details? To this question from the *Playboy* interviewer he replied:

'These are all intriguing aspects of Novel's career as a U.S. intelligence agent, and I'd love to hear about them - especially his knowledge of seditious treason - but that isn't the subject of my investigation.'

Novel's ploy is self-evident. He means to put the Central Intelligence Agency in such a spot that they'll just have to move heaven and earth to get him out of his own predicament - or take the consequences.

Garrison's rejection of Novel's terms for surrender apparently wasn't as definitive as he made it sound in the course of that interview, taken in mid-July.

For on August 1, 1967, Senior Judge Bernard J. Bagert of the New Orleans Criminal District Court, in a surprise move, ordered substantial bond reductions (to a total of \$ 5,500) in the three cases pending against Novel (two - minor - charges of theft and the Houma burglary charge). At the same time, the Judge indicated that Novel would return to New Orleans and testify before the Grand Jury.

The first charge filed against Novel after his disappearance from New Orleans, (that of a material witness in the assassination probe) will be *dropped* by the District Attorney's office if Novel returns, Judge Bagert said.

At this writing, it is not clear yet whether Novel has returned to New Orleans or when he is expected to do so. Possibly this move will be timed to coincide with the Clay Shaw trial in mid-March 1968.

In the meantime, it will be interesting to watch how the *CIA* is going to react to the challenge inherent in this arrangement. As a rule, the Agency is not in the habit of taking a lot of nonsense from former employees who can't keep their mouths shut. It must be an uncomfortable thought for Novel to ponder the fate of others who acted as he did - even under circumstances far less grave.

I wouldn't want to be in the shoes of Novel's attorney either - the one, I mean, who is sitting on a stack of explosive documents that could blow the whole Kennedy Murder Fraud sky-high.

Chapter 5

Case History of a 'Psychotic' Oil Millionaire

When District Attorney Garrison, in his statement of September 21, 1967, made the startling disclosure that the assassination of President Kennedy had been ordered and paid for by a handful of oil-rich psychotic millionaires, he didn't name any names. But I'm quite sure that all the good people of Dallas, if any of them were privileged to hear the news, instantly thought of their fellow-resident Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, the boss of the immensely rich Hunt Oil Company of Dallas.

Hunt is not only by far the richest of all the Texas oil millionaires but he is also, and more importantly, the one with the most pronounced and most vicious spleen. And, above all, the one who hated Kennedy most.

It so happens that H. L. Hunt is also a long-time friend, admirer and financial 'angel' of the most prominent Texas politician of our time, Lyndon B. Johnson, the man who was destined to become President of the United States automatically the moment Kennedy died. Perhaps this is the reason why Garrison preferred not to be too specific.

Three weeks after the assassination of President Kennedy, *The New York Times*, in an article entitled 'Action on Oil', (The News of the Week in Review, December 15, 1963) noted:

'Nowhere is oil a bigger political force than Texas, producer of 35 per cent of the nation's oil and possessor of half of its obtainable oil reserves. As a Texan in Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson was a strong advocate of oil industry causes - low import quotas and the 27½ per cent tax allowance for depletion of oil reserves . . .'

That was an understatement. The fact of the matter is that Lyndon B. Johnson, throughout his long political career, has been the most unabashed Congressional servant of the oil interests, the staunchest defender of what the New York

suburban newspaper *Newsday* on February 8, 1964 called the 'iniquitous depletion allowance on oil and gas wells.' (*Newsday* is not likely to relapse into such heresy now that its publisher is Bill Moyers, Johnson's long-time assistant and close confidant.)

Johnson's extremely close association with the oil industry and his 'perfect' voting record in Congress in favour of the oil interests, ever since he became a member of the House of Representatives in 1937, is a matter of common knowledge and need hardly be substantiated further.

For many years, there existed a close working relationship between Hunt, who generously contributed to the campaign funds of his fellow Texans on the one hand and Senator Johnson and Rep. Sam Rayburn (long-time Speaker of the House) on the other. It was a mutually profitable relationship which paid off handsomely for Hunt also.

Robert G. Sherrill, a former Texas newspaperman, has related in shocking detail in *The Nation* of February 24, 1964, how Hunt was able to wangle 100,000 acres of State-owned tidelands oil leases from the Texas land commissioner, Bascom Giles, on average bids of six dollars an acre while the overall bid average was \$ 78. Giles later went to the penitentiary for cheating the state, while Hunt, undisturbed, continues to rake in tremendous profits from his oil leases, virtually tax-free.

H. L. Hunt who, now in his 80s, looks as affable and benign as a storybook granddaddy, is certainly one of the most evil men who ever held vast economic power in America. None of the other celebrated oil tycoons, not J. Paul Getty, not Clint Murchison, not Sid Richardson, not Howard Keck or any of the others has done as much as Hunt to envenom public life in the United States through massive right-wing propaganda and financial assistance to fanatic paramilitary organizations like 'The Minutemen'.

According to the above-cited lengthy piece by Robert G. Sherrill in *The Nation* of 24-2-64 ('Portrait of a Super-Patriot'), 'one Dallas editor, who has observed him for years' has been prompted to 'say coldly' of H. L. Hunt: 'If he had more flair and imagination, if he weren't basically such a

damned hick, Hunt could be one of the most dangerous men in America.'

Hunt may be a hick and he may be lacking in flair and imagination, but he has proved nevertheless, in many ways, that he is one of the most dangerous men in America. He has poured millions upon millions of dollars into such rabble-rousing propaganda ventures as 'Facts Forum' and 'Life Line Foundation'; he has subsidized, armed and equipped the most active elements of the paramilitary Right, from the 'Minutemen' and the 'John Birch Society' to the American Nazi Party. He was one of Senator McCarthy's chief financial angels. And he most certainly had a hand in the conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy.

When Jim Garrison late in September 1967 took the plunge and bluntly stated in a radio broadcast that Kennedy had been assassinated at the instigation of a handful of immensely rich oil millionaires - something I had been saying for years in all my books about the Kennedy murder - he must have had H. L. Hunt in mind, among others.

Quite apart from the ironclad evidence Garrison must possess in order to venture such a statement in a nationwide broadcast, there exists a solid body of circumstantial evidence linking Hunt to the assassination.

To begin with, there is the incontrovertible fact that America's oil industry, after riding high for decades, was facing serious trouble at the start of the year 1963. Two of its most powerful props in Congress, Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator Robert S. Kerr (Oklahoma) had died and the third, Lyndon B. Johnson, had been effectively neutralized by his move from the Senate into the Vice-Presidency. To make things worse for the oilmen, President Kennedy was about to submit to Congress a tax reform programme designed to produce about \$ 185,000,000 in additional revenues by changes in the favorable tax treatment until then accorded the gas-oil industry.

On January 7, 1963, *The Christian Science Monitor*, in a dispatch from Dallas entitled 'Oilmen Prepare for Tax Battle', summed up the situation as follows:

'The domestic oil industry of the United States begins 1963

with its hardest fight yet before it to stave off attacks on the 27½ income tax depletion allowance which has been under fire in the Congress. . .

'With the passing of Sen. Robert S. Kerr (D) of Oklahoma, the industry has lost its strongest defender in Congress. It lost its other staunch defender with the passing of Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn (D) of Texas.

'There is no one left on the scene in Washington to compare with these two legislators in staving off liberal attacks on the depletion allowance.

'Just when the newest assault will come is uncertain. No doubt the industry will not know until President Kennedy sends up his tax programme. If the President asks for a cut in the allowance, the industry has little doubt that the Congress will take up the matter. A real fight will then be on.

'It is noted down here that about a third of the Senate generally has gone along with the interests who have termed the depletion allowance a special privilege and have tried to reduce it from 27½ per cent to 15 per cent.

'These senators will be more apt than ever to vote for the reduction if the President requests it and takes a strong stand on the issue, especially with no strong opposition leadership, such as that formerly presented by Senator Kerr . . .'

Even more revealing is the following excerpt (already quoted by me in my 1964 book *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*) from Marquis W. Childs' nationally distributed column 'Washington Calling', which was published on October 10, 1963, i.e. only 43 days before the assassination of President Kennedy:

'To a friend and long-time associate who called on him the other day President Kennedy expressed considerable bitterness on the subject of top-bracket taxpayers who use tax exemptions to spread propaganda of the extreme right.

'The President talked about two men, each of whom is often referred to as 'the richest man in the world'. One was J. Paul Getty, an oilman who spends most of his time in England. *The second was the Dallas, Tex., oilman H. L. Hunt.* Both are billionaires. Both, according to the President, paid small amounts in federal income tax last year. These

men, the President said, use various forms of tax exemption and special tax allowances to subsidize the ultra right on television, radio and in print.

'There is no doubt that the right-wing is heavily subsidized. On radio and television stations across the nation free taped programs are run daily, assailing the United Nations, attacking the graduated income tax, foreign aid, social security and the other favorite hates of the extreme right.

'One of the biggest tax benefits oilmen enjoy is the 27½ per cent depletion allowance. *In his January tax message, the President proposed a sharp reduction in this benefit, which has been extended to cover a long list of minerals. The tax bill passed by the House made only a minor change, however. The right-wing is prepared to go all out to defeat Kennedy in 1964. . .*' (italics mine - J. J.)

So the oil industry, for decades one of the most powerful forces in America, and President Kennedy were sharply at odds in 1963. In particular, H. L. Hunt, who has an annual income of about \$ 30,000,000 but who pays practically no income tax thanks to the depletion allowance, had reasons to be sore at President Kennedy. For Hunt, who obviously can't spend 30 million dollars a year on himself and his family, likes to save every penny for his extremist propaganda campaigns.

This situation rightly aroused the ire of the liberal Democratic Senator Maurine Neuberger (Oregon) who also took Hunt severely to task in a Senate speech in 1963.

'You would think,' Sen. Neuberger said, 'that a man with \$ 3 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the federal government assume a substantial portion of his political crusades. Hunt has simply packaged his propaganda network under the head of the Life Line Foundation, Inc., and then had his business corporations - the Hunt Oil Co. and its food-processing and canning division, the HLH Parade Co. - commercially sponsor Life Line propaganda throughout the country.'

At the request of Senator Neuberger, the Bureau of Internal Revenue launched an investigation of tax-exempt foun-

dations that pretended to pursue charitable and 'educational' purposes - as Life-Line did - while in fact engaging in political warfare against the Government and America's democratic institutions. By March 1963, the Bureau had arrived at the conclusion that 'Life Line Foundation, Inc.' was a *prima facie* case of such a partisan operation under false pretence and recommended revocation of its tax-exempt status.

President Kennedy's death came just in time to prevent this ruling from being put into effect and, under the new Administration, it was quietly buried. These startling facts were brought to light in the course of hearings held in the late summer of 1964 by the House Small Business sub-committee under the chairmanship of Rep. Wright Patman who also demanded that Life-Line's tax-exempt status be terminated.

In Dallas, H. L. Hunt was unctuously indignant, insisting that his Life-Line was nothing but an educational and patriotic undertaking. 'An attack is being made,' he exclaimed, 'on the right of free speech and comment.'

But Patman was unmoved by such rhetorics. 'If an old slouch like Hunt really wants to educate people,' he replied, 'he's got lots of money to do it, without putting \$ 27½ million which is tax-exempt aside for Life-Line Foundation' (*Newsweek*, 14-9-64).

One day in the fall of 1961, Dr. Albert E. Burke, a well-known TV lecturer on the West Coast, was one of a group of people who had been invited to Hunt's sumptuous villa overlooking White Rock Lake in Dallas. After the assassination of President Kennedy, Dr. Burke described his experiences at Hunt's home - without naming names - as follows:

'... I have listened to communists and other groups that can only be called enemies, accuse us of the worst intentions, the most inhuman ways of doing things, as the most dangerous people on earth, to be stopped and destroyed at all costs. . . But nothing I have heard in or from those places around us compared with the experience I had in the *Dallas* home of an American, whose hate for this country's leaders, and the way our institutions worked, was the most vicious, venomous and dangerous I have known in my life. No communist

I have ever heard, no enemy of this nation has ever done a better job of degrading or belittling this country. *That American was one of this nation's richest and most powerful men!*

'It was a very special performance by a pillar of the American community, *who influences things in his community*. It was a very special performance because in that living room during his performance - in which he said things had reached the point where there seemed to be *'no way left to get those traitors out of our government except by shooting them out'* - during that performance, there were four teenagers in that room to be influenced. His views were shared on November 22, 1963.'

'Interestingly, the man accused of that crime claimed to be a Marxist, a communist. But my host assured me - when I objected to his remarks - that he believed as he did because he was anti-communist!'

'What happened in that home in Dallas, of one of America's richest and most powerful men, shashed that goal of America as a united country for the four teenagers in on that conversation that night.'

'And Mr. Big American's actions - the actions of men like that one with whom I spent that evening in Dallas two years ago - *his actions include giving heavy donations to political campaigns of candidates he wants to see in public office running things*. It is understood that in return for his help, they will favour his views in running things. He supports political candidates and semi-secret societies. And he supports television and radio programmes which set up the environment in which things happen in this country - *even the kind of things that can lead men to assassinate Presidents in communities such men influence*. . .'

On April 29, 1964, Miss Lillian Castellano of Hollywood, California, sent a transcript of this remarkably informative, if somewhat circuitous TV lecture to the Warren Commission with this statement:

'The rich and powerful man referred to above is H. L. Hunt. His seditious, treasonable statement was made overtly, in the presence of witnesses, whose subversion he wished,

and to whom he overtly advocated the overthrow of the American Government by the assassination of its duly elected leaders.'

'Dr. Albert E. Burke was a witness to this treasonable act. Dr. Albert E. Burke can verify the identification of this man to the Commission. The Commission need only call Dr. Albert E. Burke to testify.'

Needless to say, Miss Castellano received no reply and the Warren Commission took no notice of her information. They were far too busy building a case against, and trying to find a motive for their chosen assassin, Lee H. Oswald, to be able to pay any attention to an immensely rich Dallas tycoon who had a perfect motive for having Kennedy killed, the means to finance such an operation and, most importantly, the local influence required to neutralize the forces of law and order; a man who, moreover, had openly advocated 'shooting traitors out of the Government' in the presence of at least five witnesses. The Commission did not call Dr. Burke to testify and it exhibited no interest in identifying the four teenagers present at that party who, two years later, would be men of about Oswald's age.

Dr. Burke is not the only witness to attest to Hunt's murderous intentions towards Kennedy. In his piece in *The Nation* (*loc. cit.*) Robert G. Sherrill had this extraordinarily revealing paragraph:

'In the weeks immediately preceding the assassination of President Kennedy, the commentators of Life-Line were daily warning their listeners that his tyrannical Administration was by-passing the laws of Congress, following a line ordered by Moscow, suppressing the chief spokesmen for freedom in the land and forcing American taxpayers to subsidize communism around the world. It was a time, Life-Line insisted, that cried out for 'extreme patriotism', and by a *ghoulish coincidence*, the programme broadcast in the Dallas area on the morning of the assassination prophesied a day when American citizens would no longer be allowed to *own firearms with which to gun down their rulers*. Under communism, which is seen as imminent in this country, 'no firearms are permitted the people, because they would then have

the weapons with which to rise up against their oppressors!'

So to Robert G. Sherrill and *The Nation* it was just a 'ghoulish coincidence' that H. L. Hunt's propaganda network, on the very day President Kennedy was murdered, pleaded, in that very same Dallas area, for firearms with which American 'patriots' could gun down their rulers!

Just as it was mere coincidence in the eyes of the Warren Commission, that Nelson Bunker Hunt, the eldest son of H. L. Hunt, had put up the money, along with two other wealthy Dallas businessmen, for that notorious, black-bordered full page ad in *The Dallas Morning News* which greeted President Kennedy on his arrival by accusing him of every conceivable treachery under the sun.

And it was, of course, just another coincidence that Jack Ruby, on the very eve of the assassination, had driven a 'job-hunting' young girl to the office of Lamar Hunt, another of H. L. Hunt's sons. Says the Warren Report, innocent as ever, 'Although Ruby stated that he would like to meet Hunt, seemingly to establish a business connection, he did not enter Hunt's office with her.' There is really something nauseating about that.

'There is no evidence that the killer of Mr. Kennedy was incited by Life-Line,' Mr. Sherrill piously remarks after relating how the Hunt network all over the country had called for citizens to bear arms against their government.

'There is no evidence . . . That is the cheap catch-all phrase they have all used, time and again, from the Warren Commission down through Epstein, Manchester, Sherrill and others, to avoid thinking the unthinkable and speaking out the unspeakable. Even when the evidence hits them slap between the eyes.

Perhaps the most interesting information about Hunt's involvement in the assassination has been provided by H. L. Hunt himself in a 'candid conversation' with a *Playboy* reporter in 1966. Said Hunt:

'By the way you might be interested to know that the UPI quoted Senator Maurine Neuberger a few minutes after the assassination to the effect that if anyone is responsible for the assassination, it is H. L. Hunt of Dallas, Texas. Well, soon

after that, my house began receiving a few friendly calls of warning and many threatening calls to the effect that I would be shot next, and also to tell Mrs. Hunt she would be shot. My office force would not consent to either of us going home even to get our clothing. We were sent out of town, and neither the police department nor the FBI would consent to us returning to Dallas until a few days before Christmas.'

Here is striking confirmation of what I wrote in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*: 'According to *The Realist*, March 1964, the FBI "within an hour of the shooting went to H. L. Hunt and advised him to get out of Dallas, fast. Under an assumed name, he took American Airlines flight 42 to New York!..."

'Why should the FBI warn Hunt, and why should he take their advice and fly?' I went on to say in this book. 'Are the local FBI agents his servants? Or accomplices?...'

Try to visualize the situation in Dallas at that crucial moment. From his seventh floor office in the towering Mercantile Bank Building, only about ten blocks east of the Kennedy assassination site, H. L. Hunt has just cheerfully observed the fulfilment of his desires on Dealey Plaza. The time is now about 1:30 p.m. and Kennedy has been dead for half an hour. This means that the FBI is under the control of the new Chief Executive, Lyndon B. Johnson.

And what does the FBI do at that moment when all of its energies should have been concentrated on a massive hunt for the assassins of the President? It has nothing more imperative to do than rush to the office of the most influential man in Dallas and tell him to get out of town, fast. So fast, indeed, that he isn't even allowed to make a quick trip to his mansion, well guarded as it is by armed bodyguards, to change his clothes. Off with him, quick, under an assumed name, to faraway New York!

Why was the FBI in such a hurry to get Hunt out of town? I'll tell you, why. Because, at that moment, the conspirators were in a panic. Something very important had gone wrong with their otherwise well-planned and perfectly executed scheme: not only had Oswald, the intended scapegoat, vanished from the scene of the crime, but Governor Connally had

been wounded and somehow the impossible fact that 'Oswald' must have fired three bullets would have to be explained. (See Chapter 14). It is possible that Oswald was told to disappear to give the conspirators time to work out the next move. But with suspicion already centring on Hunt, as Senator Neuberger's remark shows, he obviously had to be quickly got out of the way.

And so the Dallas Police, whose chiefs were up to their necks in the conspiracy,* and the local FBI agents who are in cahoots with them - some of them, anyway - were not going to take any chances with their 'country hick' Boss, but preferred to spirit him out of town, and keep him out of town, until things returned to normal.

Most noteworthy of all is Hunt's reaction to the following question put to him by the *Playboy* reporter:

'In *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*, the author, Joachim Joesten, claimed that President Kennedy intended to make you and other oil millionaires pay a greatly increased amount of income tax. "With that kind of money at stake," Joesten wrote, "murder, even Presidential murder, is not out of the question." That borders on a very serious charge against you. What do you have to say about this?'

Hunt's reply: 'Before the 1960 elections, the Kennedys were in the oil business. Congress, rather than the President, formulates the law applicable to oil products. I was never apprehensive about President Kennedy's attitude. I had never heard of Oswald. After the assassination, I heard that the Justice Department had caused previous charges against Oswald to be dropped - which made it possible for him to be available to shoot anyone he might decide to shoot.'

Was there ever a lamer rebuttal offered to the most serious charge in the world? And doesn't that weak and evasive reply clearly bespeak Hunt's guilty conscience?

* Cf. *Oswald: The Truth*, Part II.

Chapter 6

Oswald, Ruby and 'Oswald'

When and where was the idea born to change the government of the United States through the assassination of President Kennedy?

Garrison seems to think that the impulse sprang from the frustration of the anti-Castro Cubans and their Minutemen friends after Kennedy had sent the FBI down to put their 'assassins camp' out of commission on July 31, 1963.

I do not hold with this view. It is my firm belief that the original plan to kill Kennedy was hatched over three years before it was executed; in fact even before he was elected president.

But that is neither here nor there, for the time being. I'm merely setting it down for the record because I believe that in due course this unorthodox opinion of mine will be vindicated like so many other things I have asserted at a time when no one was prepared to support me.

As for the specific murder plot that came to fruition at Dallas on November 22, 1963, it is now possible to establish a timetable that encompasses much of its planning.

Thus, it is thanks to a recent legal move by the defence for Clay Shaw that a hitherto unsuspected early date in the preparatory stage has come to light. In a bill of particulars request filed with the court after Clay Shaw had been bound over for trial, the attorneys for the defendant asked for details concerning a conspiratorial meeting between Shaw, Ruby and Oswald which according to the District Attorney, had taken place at Baton Rouge, La., at an unspecified date.

Judge Haggerty thereupon ordered the District Attorney, on August 16, 1967, to furnish the defence with particulars about the alleged meeting. Garrison complied immediately and stated in a bill of particulars, filed with the court on August 18, that:

'On or about September 3, 1963, ... approximately

between the hours of 2 p.m. and 9 p.m.' a meeting took place between Clay Shaw, Jack Ruby, David Ferrie and Lee Harvey Oswald at the Jack Tar Capitol House, a Baton Rouge hotel. As if to underline the otherwise specific nature of this data, the District Attorney added that the number of the room in which the meeting took place was unknown to the state.

The first important conclusion to be drawn from this bill of particulars is that Ruby, Oswald, Ferrie and Shaw all knew each other. The Warren Commission contended that Oswald and Ruby were *not* acquainted (the two others had not yet figured in the case at the time); Shaw has formally denied having known Oswald and so did Ferrie before his death.*

In his early pronouncements on the results of his investigation, Garrison never mentioned Jack Ruby's name. However, on May 12, 1967, the New Orleans Grand Jury was informed by the DA's office that *Jack Ruby's unlisted phone number had been found in code in address books belonging to Lee Harvey Oswald and to Clay Shaw.*

Garrison's experts did not have too much trouble breaking this code. Proceeding from the fact that Oswald's address book, reproduced in the Warren Report, contains the reference 'P.O. Box 19106' and that the same number subsequently showed up among possessions of Clay Shaw seized by Garrison, they did some fast calculating which led to the discovery that 'P.O. Box 19106' was in fact the coded version of Ruby's ex-directory telephone number in Dallas.

The obvious inference from this established fact is that Ruby, Oswald and Shaw were all in some shady business together, though it does not necessarily mean that this was, from the outset, a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. It would seem rather that the connecting link between the three men was originally their common allegiance to the CIA.

Indeed, Garrison has made it unmistakably clear, on various occasions, that he has evidence to the effect that Oswald and Ruby were CIA agents and he has strongly hinted

* For detailed information about David Ferrie and his convenient demise in the early stage of the Garrison investigation, see my book *The Garrison Enquiry*, Chapter 3 ('The Opportune Death of David Ferrie').

- though, in this case, he had to be very careful in what he said - that Clay Shaw, too, was connected with the intelligence agency.

At one point during the *Playboy* interview he stressed that Oswald's close contacts with paramilitary activists and anti-Castro Cubans in New Orleans 'overlapped' with similar groups in Dallas who were deeply involved in smuggling guns to the anti-Castro underground (on behalf of the *CIA*), and that in one of these groups Jack Ruby played a key-part.

Toward the end of May, 1967, a bizarre interlude related to the late Jack Ruby occurred. In letters sent to the American and Louisiana bar associations on May 26, the Detroit lawyer Sol Dann, who had been one of Ruby's attorneys (he did not join the long list of lawyers active on Ruby's behalf until after the latter's conviction) urged the disbarment of Garrison for 'unwarranted and reckless attacks on the Warren Commission and its members.'

As far as is known, neither bar association took any action and it is indeed hard to see why anything Garrison has had to say about the Warren Report should be construed as unethical conduct. As a matter of fact, Garrison has always evinced a tendency to spare the Warren Commission as much as possible, even if he has described their report as a 'fairy tale', and more recently as a 'fraud'.

On May 28, Garrison replied to Dann with a statement saying that the reason the Detroit lawyer wanted him disbarred was because 'he knows that I am going to connect Ruby with the conspiracy' to assassinate President Kennedy.

In the same context, Garrison stated that he was going to 'defer' making any further arrests for the present time but then added:

'But there will be other arrests, and they will probably be before the trial.' (There has been another arrest as the reader will find at the end of this chapter.)

As if to explain why his investigation was now proceeding 'at a snail's pace', Garrison then dropped this caustic remark: 'Our office was almost put out of commission, as if it were bombarded by artillery' - an obvious reference to the concerted press attacks on his enquiry. Since then, the 'bom-

bardment' has grown in intensity and the 'artillery' is constantly bringing up reinforcements.*

To go back to the timetable of the conspiracy, the next known meeting of the plotters took place in mid-September 1963, as described in detail by eyewitness Perry Russo.**

It is worthy of note, though, that Ruby was *not* present at that meeting, which was held at David Ferrie's apartment. The participants were, according to Russo, Shaw, Ferrie, a man who called himself 'Leon Oswald,' two Cubans ('Manuel' and 'Julian'), the witness himself and his girl friend (who left before the men got down to the business at hand).

The fact that Ruby did not attend the meeting at which a veritable blue-print for the Dealey Plaza ambush was drawn up by Ferrie suggests that while he may have been 'connected' with the conspiracy, he was not in fact one of those who plotted to assassinate President Kennedy.

In *Oswald: The Truth* I made the point - and I believe the reader will agree that I made a pretty strong case for it - that Ruby was not involved in the Kennedy Murder plot in the sense of being one of those who wanted to kill the President. Ruby had a plot of his own that was aimed at eliminating Governor John Connally who was standing in the way of the hoodlums with whom Ruby was also associated (Garrison: 'Ruby seems to have been as good an employee of the CIA as he was a pimp for the Dallas cops').

I cannot here go into the details of that complex story again, fully explored as it is in my above-named book. Suffice it to say that my belief that Ruby was gunning only for Connally, not for Kennedy, is based on an affidavit of considerable length, minute detail and evident validity which is moreover the deposition of a lawyer-witness, Carroll Jarnagin. The full text and my interpretation of it will be found in Chapter I and II of *Oswald: The Truth*.

* Numerous examples of unwarranted attacks in the press against Garrison and attempts to discredit him personally will be found in *The Garrison Enquiry*.

** For particulars, see 'The Testimony of Perry Russo' (Chapter 5 of *The Garrison Enquiry*).

To put it briefly, Jarnagin overheard a conversation between Ruby and a young man who called himself H. L. Lee, at the Carousel Club, in the course of which arrangements for the shooting of Governor Connally from the Texas School Book Depository in Dallas and during a public parade were discussed. Jarnagin reported the plot to the Texas Department of Public Safety on October 5, 1963, by telephone, but no action was taken by the police.

While Jarnagin, after the events in Dallas of November 22, 1963, in a letter to the FBI expressed the view that the young man he had seen with Ruby, and who was to carry out the murder assignment, was Lee Harvey Oswald (whose picture Jarnagin subsequently saw on television), Oswald had in fact spent the entire evening of October 4 - date of the conspiratorial meeting at the Carousel - with his family at the Paine home in Irving. This has been established by the Warren Commission.

If Oswald had an alibi for that night, then Ruby's visitor, who must have borne a resemblance to him sufficiently striking to cause Jarnagin's mistake of identity, was undoubtedly the False or 'Second' Oswald who played a role of cardinal importance in the Kennedy Murder Fraud.

I have explored the amazing case of the False Oswald in three of my books,* all written before the Garrison probe became a matter of public knowledge. Indeed, Part I of *Oswald: The Truth* is entitled 'The False Oswald' and deals with his strange doings in 13 chapters and over a total 121 pages. The story is based in its entirety on facts the Warren Commission itself brought to light, and amply documented although it paid not the slightest attention to its own findings.

The *Playboy* interview again reveals that Garrison shares my views on this subject. One of the conspirators, he claims, deliberately impersonated Oswald before the assassination, and he believes he knows his identity. He was a young man who used Oswald's name and whose description was similar. He was employed to create the impression of an unstable and

suspicious character whom people would remember after Kennedy's death.

Garrison then goes briefly into *some* of the episodes which I have described in ample detail in *Oswald: The Truth* and winds up his remarks on this subject by saying: 'I could go on and on recounting similar instances, but *there is no doubt that there was indeed a "second Oswald"?*'

Garrison, however, was reluctant to stress this angle of his investigation, because, as he put it 'it was a story that already made Doctor No and Goldfinger read like auditors' reports'. The whole story does indeed prove that truth is far stranger than fiction.

I should like to point out here that Garrison has an evident predilection for the term 'second Oswald' (which Prof. Popkin favours in a book thus entitled), rather than the expression 'The False Oswald' which I originated. In spite of this divergence in terminology, however, Garrison made it perfectly clear that he looks upon that individual as a *hostile* double ('impersonated. . . in order to incriminate'), as I have done throughout, whereas Professor Popkin inclines to the view that the 'Second Oswald' was an accomplice and a substitute for Lee Harvey Oswald.*

Who is, or was, this individual? Garrison so far has carefully refrained from giving him a name though he says that he has 'discovered' his identity. Now the fact of the matter is that I identified this man years ago. I did so first in my book *Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord* which was published in September 1966 and had been completed, in manuscript, more than a year before. And I made the identification again, at much greater length and with plenty of fresh corroborative information in *Oswald: The Truth*.

Maybe I am wrong in this respect, but unless and until Garrison produces evidence in court to show that this 'second Oswald' is somebody else, I shall continue to hold that this individual is, or was, *Larry Crafard*, Ruby's handman and bar-

* They are: *Oswald: The Truth*, *Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord* and *La vérité sur le cas de Jack Ruby*.

* The *London Times*, however, reported as early as February 20, 1967: 'The District Attorney's office in New Orleans is understood to be pursuing a line of enquiry related to the theory of a 'false Oswald'.

keeper at the Carousel.

What are my reasons for believing that Larry Crafard is the person who deliberately impersonated Oswald over a period of several weeks, manifestly for the purpose of planting false clues that would incriminate Oswald after the assassination and thus divert attention from the real murderers of the President?

While I cannot go into the matter at any length here, I shall briefly outline some of the points of evidence which I have developed in *Oswald: The Truth*.

In the first place, the Warren Report itself notes that 'Ruth Paine testified that Crafard's photograph bears a strong resemblance to Oswald.'

Secondly, the Report recounts an episode in which a Dallas electronics salesman, Robert K. Patterson, and two of his associates expressed the belief that they had seen Ruby, in the company of Oswald, enter their store. The Commission, however, established that Ruby's companion on this occasion was Larry Crafard.

Thirdly, about half a dozen people testified, or told the police or the FBI, that they had seen a person *resembling Oswald* at the Carousel Club, while the real Lee Harvey Oswald, according to the Commission, never set foot there.

In the fourth place, Larry Crafard, again according to the Commission, lived at the Carousel Club while working for Ruby from mid-October until the day after the assassination, when he hurriedly left. It is particularly worthy of note that the time when Crafard took up his job with Ruby closely coincides with the time Oswald was planted at the Texas School Book Depository by solicitous but false friends who procured the job for him.

The clincher, however, is the testimony of a waitress at the B & B Café in Dallas, next door to the Carousel Club, who stated, in a Dallas police affidavit, that she had served Ruby and Oswald together at 3 a.m. on the morning of November 22 - Assassination Day.

Now, it is established beyond a shadow of doubt that Oswald at that time was asleep with his family at the Paine place in Irving. And, what's much more important, Crafard himself

told the FBI - his statement is on record among the unclassified papers at the National Archives - that *he* had had breakfast with Ruby at the B & B Café on the morning of November 22, between 2.30 and 3.30 a.m.

All this goes to prove conclusively that Crafard is, or was, indeed the False Oswald.

I do not know what has become of Crafard. He was picked up by the FBI in Michigan, a week after the assassination, and then vanished from sight. I suppose he is dead, like so many key witnesses in the case, and may have been for a long time. Otherwise I should certainly have heard from him - or from his lawyers.

There is reason to believe that the plan to substitute the false for the real Oswald was adopted, within the circle of conspirators, some time after the September 3 meeting in Baton Rouge. For, Garrison's bill of particulars states unmistakably that Lee Harvey Oswald, along with Shaw, Ferrie and Ruby attended that conference at the Capitol House Hotel.

By contrast the 'Leon Oswald' who attended the meeting at David Ferrie's apartment in mid-September 1963, was certainly not Lee Harvey Oswald, as the testimony of Perry Russo (see *The Garrison Enquiry*) has clearly brought out, even though most of the newspapers missed the point or deliberately overlooked it.

This was the impersonator, the hostile double - Larry Crafard. And it was he again who, ten days later, called on Mrs. Sylvia Odio in Dallas, accompanied by two Cubans.

Was Lee Harvey Oswald aware of the fact that he had a double, that Crafard had taken his place among the conspirators, perhaps even that he himself was being groomed for the role of a scapegoat?

These questions are not as absurd as they sound, and they have clearly occurred to Garrison also. In the *Playboy* interview he expressed the view that he did not think Oswald was aware of his role as decoy but feels that even if he were he might have been reassured by promises of being smuggled out of the country and rich rewards. But it is more probable, and Garrison shares this view, that he would not have felt any necessity to escape. No jury in the world would have been able

to find him guilty on the obviously contrived and trumped-up evidence, and Oswald quite possibly knew this.

He was double-crossed and sacrificed by his associates in intelligence operations and in the conspiracy, there can be no doubt about that. And so, in a sense, was Ruby who got the surprise of his life on November 22, 1963, when he learned that President Kennedy, not Governor Connally, had been killed in the ambush he had helped to set up.*

There remains some uncertainty as to how exactly the plot to murder Kennedy was made to overlap and to supersede the plot Ruby had hatched for the elimination of Governor Connally. Perhaps the Clay Shaw trial will provide the answer.

Since these lines were written a number of important developments have occurred in New Orleans. The first was the issue of a warrant on December 20, 1967 for the arrest of a Mr. Edgar Eugene Bradley on a charge of conspiracy to murder John F. Kennedy. Bradley is an employee of the Reverend Carl McIntire, the president of the American Council of Churches, an ultra right-wing organisation. Bradley's job was to sell Dr. McIntire's syndicated radio broadcasts to West Coast stations and he lives in California.

According to the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* of December 22, Bradley was immediately bombarded with telephone calls from newspapers around the world, and answered reporters' queries with denials that he was in Dallas on the day of the assassination and such pearls of wisdom as: 'If Garrison is going to press trumped-up charges, he will have to be prepared to prove them.' From which one can conclude that trumped-up charges have to be proved, but those of any other type do not.

Garrison was quoted as saying: 'Our evidence indicates that he was in Dallas. Furthermore, I think I can say with assurance that the federal government and federal investigative agencies and the Dallas investigative agencies know he was in Dallas, and know precisely what he was doing.'

In the statement issued with the arrest warrant, Garrison

had had this to say: 'Like Clay Shaw, Mr. Bradley's name did not come up in the federal 'investigation' of the assassination nor is his name mentioned anywhere in the 26 volumes of the Warren Report 'inquiry' into the case.'

The next development occurred six days later. Garrison held a nationally televised press conference on the day after Christmas at which he charged that Oswald had sent a telegram five days before the assassination to FBI headquarters in Washington, a telegram which J. Edgar Hoover had certainly seen, in which he warned that an attempt would be made on the 22nd. The fact that Oswald was a paid FBI informer and that no regard was paid to his information, speaks volumes. But Garrison was aiming at even higher targets than the head of the FBI. No one he claimed was doing more than President Johnson to shield the real assassins of John Kennedy. He should not be allowed to get away with it, he said.

The reaction from Washington was almost instantaneous. The Pentagon immediately released Garrison's army medical record, a document that is strictly confidential, and it was published in the *Chicago Tribune*. 'This patient has a severe and disabling psychoneurosis of long duration. It has interfered with his social and professional adjustment to a marked degree. He is considered totally disabled from the standpoint of military duty and moderately incapacitated in civilian adaptability. His illness existed long before his call to active duty and is of the type that will require long psycho-therapeutic approach.' This was what the citizens of America were supposed to believe about a man who had piloted an unarmed spotter plane in Europe during World War II, had served in the FBI, was a colonel in the National Guard, and had been for five years the DA of an important American city.

Two days later Garrison struck back. Three new material witnesses were subpoenaed. Their names were Loran Hall, Thomas Beckman and Lawrence Howard. According to the New Orleans *States-Item* of that day (December 29) the subpoenas for Hall and Howard said that the DA had information that they checked into the Dallas Young Men's Christian Association in October, 1963, and remained in Dallas

* Cf. the chapter 11 'A Nasty Surprise for Ruby', of my book *Oswald: The Truth*.

until the time of the Kennedy slaying. Both had been in contact with Jack Ruby and 'other individuals believed to be involved in the assassination'. In addition, Hall had been in association with Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas. Both had previously been in New Orleans where they had been in contact with David Ferrie and other individuals who frequented 531 Lafayette Street, (i.e. 544 Camp Street). Both had been active in the 'Free Cuba' movement in Florida, Louisiana and Texas and had been engaged in CIA-sponsored guerilla training in Florida for raids on Cuba. Hall had brought a weapon to Dallas shortly before the assassination.

Beckham on the other hand 'had knowledge of CIA-sponsored guerrilla training conducted near New Orleans', and also of the intelligence activities conducted in the office of W. Guy Banister. He was subsequently reported to be in Dallas in November of 1963 and his subpoena added that a number of those persons with whom he was in contact in New Orleans and Dallas 'are believed to have played a part in the assassination.'

In a statement issued in connection with the subpoenas, Garrison said 'Each of the three witnesses was in a unique position to observe activities relevant to the assassination. None of them were questioned by the Warren Commission.' (It should be noted here that the Warren Commission was not unaware of their existence. The FBI had questioned both Hall and Howard to discover if they had visited Mrs. Odio in Dallas in September 1963. They both denied although one had at first admitted it.) Garrison then went on to explain that they had not been questioned because the Commission's objective 'was to hide the fact that for the first time in American history, a *coup d'etat* had occurred, resulting in the carefully planned execution of a President of the United States.' This use of the word 'execution' clearly implies a firing squad and as if to reinforce this impression, Garrison went on to say that 'Kennedy plainly was shot from a number of different directions.' The reader will find in Chapter 14 an account of what I believe Garrison really meant by this.

Chapter 7

Ruby's last chance

'The most fantastic story you ever heard'

On Sunday, June 7, 1964, at a quarter to noon, 15 persons filed into the Interrogation Room at the Dallas County Jail at the corner of Main and Houston Streets in Dallas, Texas. Outside the massive building Dealey Plaza, where President Kennedy had been slain seven-and-a-half months earlier, lay bathed in sunshine. But the room where the fifteen gathered to probe the mystery of that death was cool and tomblike.

It was an incongruous meeting, in an incongruous setting. The two principals in the place seemed to have come from different worlds and stood at opposite ends of life's ladder.

One was the Chief Justice of the United States, the benign-looking Earl Warren who at that time had just about reached the pinnacle of his fame. As Chairman of the President's Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy, Warren, after a decade of distinguished service on the Supreme Bench, was the universally respected, even revered father figure of American Justice.

The man he had come to see, Jack Ruby, was just about the ultimate in contrast: a product of the Chicago slums, a honky-tonk operator, a pimp, a narcotics peddler, an undercover agent and a convicted murderer. Yet he was also the last surviving principal of the November 22-24 Dallas events and a man with a tremendous and potentially explosive story to tell.

That was precisely the reason why Chief Justice Warren, one of the busiest of top officials in Washington, had decided to fly down to Dallas for a personal interview with a death-cell inmate, instead of having him brought to Commission headquarters, as all normal rules of investigation and precedent would have required.

For more than six months, the Commission had studiously avoided listening to the story that Jack Ruby, potentially the No. 1 witness in the investigation, might have had to tell. But it couldn't very well conclude its labours, and issue its Report

- which at that late date was nearly completed - without at least going through the motions of taking Ruby's testimony.

Warren knew only too well what to expect of a condemned man, especially one as shrewd and resourceful as Jack Ruby. When you have nothing more to lose, because all is lost, anyway, but possibly something to gain by making a clean breast of it, then the temptation to talk is overwhelming.

By the time the Commission decided on hearing Ruby - in fact, even by the time the first Hearings had got under way some four months earlier - the seven sages had already made up their minds as to what the essentials of their verdict were going to be: Lee H. Oswald killed the President alone and unaided and was then in turn shot by Ruby, again acting entirely on his own, without a trace of conspiracy to be found anywhere.

Under the circumstances, what good could come of allowing Ruby to talk *freely*? The first prerequisite, so Warren decided, and as the whole record conspicuously shows, would be to hold the hearing in a setting of proper restraint where the prisoner could be made to feel that he was *not* expected to talk and where the floodgates could be quickly shut off if perchance they did unexpectedly open.

That's why the Mountain went to see Mahomet, instead of the other way round. That's also why Ruby's questioning by the Commission (represented by Warren, Representative Gerald R. Ford, and General Counsel J. Lee Rankin, with four of its Counsels also in attendance) took place not only in the forbidding environment of a jail, but also in the presence of:

Sheriff Bill Decker

Deputy Sheriff Orvill Smith, assigned to Ruby

E. L. Holman, Chief Jailer

Jim Dowie, Assistant District Attorney (representing Henry Wade) and Elmer W. Moore, Special Agent, U.S. Secret Service.

Faced with such awesome odds, Ruby played it cool. His three-hour-long testimony, often described as 'rambling', 'baffling' and 'confused', is revealed, upon closer inspection, to be a remarkable document.

It shows Ruby talking not only out of both sides of his mouth, as it were, but also on two distinct levels of understanding. While his testimony, on one hand, shows telltale traces of coaching, even of brainwashing* it reveals on the other hand a clear-cut, and increasingly frantic, determination to get a message through - a message which Warren either failed to grasp, or to which, more likely, he firmly closed his ears.

Frequently, throughout the 102-page transcript of the hearing** Ruby does indeed seem to be rambling, reeling off a hundred trivial details, or indulging in long-winded outpourings of self-pity, only to burst forth, at the appropriate moment, with an astonishing statement or suggestion that flash-like illuminates vital aspects of the murky scene.

It is only when he thus departs from the (mentally) prepared script, adlibbing freely, that Ruby's testimony contributes substantial information and affords the observer glimpses of insight into what really happened.

For instance, Ruby, early in his testimony, after giving a lengthy account of doubtful truthfulness about his movements on the eve of, and morning of, November 22, describes the scene at the *Dallas Morning News*, where he had gone to place an advertisement in these terms:

'I think it was 12.00 o'clock or fifteen minutes after 12.00, I don't recall what, but John Newman (advertising employee at the *News* - J. J.) said someone had been shot. . . And someone else came running over and he said a Secret Service man was shot, or something to that effect. And I am there in the middle with John Newman, because Newman isn't paying any attention to anyone else, and there is a lot going back and forth.'

* At one point in his testimony, Ruby actually says: '... and it seems as you get further into something, even though you know what you did, it operates against you somehow, *brain washes* you that you are weak in what you want to tell the truth about and what to say which is the truth.'

** In a noteworthy scoop, the transcript was first published in the *New York Journal American* of August 18-20, 1964, by Dorothy Kilgallen and later embodied in the *Hearings* of the Warren Commission.

'So someone must have made a statement that Governor Connally was shot. I don't recall what was said. And I was in a state of hysteria, I mean. You say, "Oh my God, it can't happen". You carry on crazy sayings.'

Three people reportedly shot - and there is no mention of President Kennedy in all this! What is more, the one shooting victim named is Governor Connally. As has been amply demonstrated in *Oswald: The Truth* (see also the preceding chapter of the present book), Ruby's concern was with Connally, not Kennedy. He *wanted* the Governor shot, which is why he instantly caught the good news. But the last thing in the world Ruby wanted was for the President to be killed also. That's why the earlier report that 'someone' had been shot, didn't register with Ruby at all, although that 'someone' can only have been Kennedy.

When Ruby at last realized what had happened, he was, in his own words, in a state of hysteria, and for good reason. His whole private murder plot, aimed only at Connally, had gone wrong, and the consequences could only be disastrous. At that moment the sky fell down on Jack Ruby and the little man went to pieces. In his own words, Ruby 'became very emotional.'

Being emotional is a rare state of mind for a tough, hard-boiled gangster like Ruby. He was overcome with emotion not because 'our beloved President' had been killed but because he himself was now in a fix, being up to his neck in a conspiracy that had hit the wrong target. For Ruby couldn't know that his fellow-plotters who had double-crossed him in order to get rid of President Kennedy as well as Connally, had also made ample preparations for covering up their own crime. Apparently he even thought that the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, would leave no stone unturned to avenge the murder of his predecessor. That's why Ruby said to Newman, on the spur of the moment, and later repeated this remark during his interview with Warren, 'John, I will have to leave Dallas.'

The Warren Commission actually put that telltale remark in its Report, without realizing, or without seeming to realize, all that it meant.

Ruby goes on and on and then suddenly, out of a blue sky, he pops at Warren the question:

'Is there any way to get me to Washington?'

Warren (obviously taken aback): 'I beg you pardon?'

Ruby: 'Is there any way of you getting me to Washington?'

Warren: 'I don't know of any. I will be glad to talk to your counsel about what the situation is, Mr. Ruby, when we get an opportunity to talk.'

It was an evidently evasive reply and an insincere one at that. Warren had been given - outwardly, anyway - virtually unlimited powers in conducting this investigation. For him to say that he didn't know of any way to get Ruby to Washington was the height of hypocrisy. All he had to do, had he really wanted Ruby to come out with the truth, would have been to issue a subpoena directing the Dallas authorities to take their prisoner to Washington. It was as simple as that.

Ruby was now getting edgy: 'I don't think I'll get a fair representation with my counsel, Joe Tonahill. I don't think so. I would like to request that I go to Washington and you take all the tests that I have to take. It is very important.'

If Warren caught the urgency in that plea, he didn't let on. He dodged the issue again and made Ruby go on with his - largely fanciful - story.

Before long, however, Ruby was again belabouring the issue that kept preying on his mind, with added emphasis. As he spoke, he even threw a pad on the table:

'... Gentlemen, unless you get me to Washington, you can't get a fair shake out of me. If you understand my way of talking, you have got to bring me to Washington to get the tests. Do I sound dramatic? Off the beam?'

At this point, Warren who was getting embarrassed, tried the soothing approach, as if he were talking to a small boy instead of to a condemned criminal at bay:

'No, you are speaking very, very rational, and I am really surprised that you can remember as much as you have remembered up to the present time. You have given it to us in detail.'

But Ruby was not interested in soft soap, not in the jam he was in. He kept hammering at this favourite theme:

'Unless you can get me to Washington, and I am not a crackpot, I have all my sense - I don't want to evade any crime I am guilty of. . . Unless you get me to Washington immediately. . .'

Warren kept turning a totally deaf ear to all this, and the question and answers game went on as before, involving a myriad things, few of them really relevant, none approaching the heart of the matter.

Towards the end of his interrogation, Ruby, getting increasingly desperate, and apparently still in the belief that the Commission was really looking for the truth, blurted out what must have been almost the last thing on earth Warren wanted to hear from him.

'At this moment,' he said, 'there is a certain organization in this area that has been indoctrinated, that I am the one that was in the plot to assassinate our President.'

As Dorothy Kilgallen immediately pointed out in her commentary on this portion of the transcript published in *The New York Journal American*, "The key words are Ruby's reference to "the plot". He is definite about this - that the plot did exist. *Ruby does not identify those who conspired to murder John F. Kennedy in Dallas last November 22.* (italics in the original). But he is mortally afraid of being linked with them.'

The editors of *The Journal American* evidently shared her view, for they splashed the story, in the issue of August 20, 1964, on the frontpage under huge bannerlines:

EXCLUSIVE

RUBY TESTIMONY BEFORE WARREN INQUIRY 'PLOT' AGAINST JFK: 'I WASN'T IN IT'

PLOT. The terrible word was out, uttered calmly by a key witness testifying before the Chairman of the Commission himself. There was absolutely no mistaking the significance of this statement, nor the urgency Ruby put into it.

Yet Warren, instead of seizing upon it and asking Ruby to elaborate - or using the occasion to summon Ruby for further hearings in Washington - merely replied:

'Would you tell us what this is?'

Ruby instantly took the cue. Warren's reference was not to the plot, but only to the organization that was saying such terrible things about him. He replied: 'The John Birch Society.'

The moment of truth had come and gone, never again to return.

Not that the John Birch Society was a topic lacking in interest. As a matter of fact, much of the conversation that followed was devoted to it. Once more Ruby complained that 'through certain falsehoods that have been said about me to other people, the John Birch Society, *I am as good as guilty as the accused assassin of President Kennedy.* How can you remedy that, Mr. Warren? Do any of you men have any ways of remedying that? *Mr. Bill Decker said be a man and speak up. I am making a statement now that I may not live the next hour when I walk out of this room.*'

The last sentence clearly bespeaks Ruby's fears of being murdered by the police. He wasn't going to 'walk out of this room' anywhere but back to his cell. And he realized now that he had already been talking too much. But it was too late for retreat and so Ruby lunged forward:

'Now it is the most fantastic story you have ever heard in a lifetime. I did something out of the goodness of my heart. . .'

I doubt that Jack Ruby ever did anything out of what he calls the goodness of his heart, but I'm sure that he could have told the most fantastic story ever heard in a lifetime. This remark, incidentally, is in tune with Jim Garrison's appraisal of the case. Garrison has repeatedly used the expression 'straight out of *Alice in Wonderland*' and once expressed the view, that it was a case that made *Dr. No* and *Goldfinger* 'look like auditors' reports.'

But Ruby never got down to essentials during the three-hour hearing by the Commission. He was off once more on what has obviously become an *idée fixe* with him: If only he had been able to tell his story five or six months ago, he proclaims, 'a certain organization wouldn't have so completely formed now, so powerfully, to use me because I am of the

Jewish extraction, Jewish faith, to commit the most dastardly crime that has ever been committed.'

The meaning of this seemingly obscure sentence will become a lot clearer if one remembers that Ruby's Mafia-inspired scheme to kill Governor Connally had been diverted by other conspirators, cleverer and more powerful than he, into an assassination plot aimed at the President. That is how Ruby, the Jew, had been 'used... to commit the most dastardly crime.'

Strangely enough, Garrison's description of Oswald as a man who had been 'first a decoy, then a patsy and finally a victim' also fits the case of Jack Ruby. He had indeed been used, and misused, by the leaders of the game, first in a diversionary role, then as a secondary scapegoat and, in the end sacrificed as callously as he himself had killed Oswald.

Ruby is also quite right in suspecting that his Jewishness was an important factor in the scheme. The people who really engineered the Kennedy murder are, for the most part, just as rabidly anti-Semitic as they are anti-Communist. Not all of them, indeed, for not all of them have openly declared their anti-semitism. Garrison's emphasis on the 'neo-Nazi' or even simply 'Nazi' inspiration behind the murder, which has already been discussed, also underlines this peculiar aspect of the case.

To these people, the next best thing to a makebelieve Communist assassin of the President is a makebelieve Jewish assassin. Ruby perfectly filled the bill.

However, Ruby's apocalyptic visions - frequently and almost turgidly expressed during his interview with Warren - of his entire family and even the whole Jewish race being in danger of extermination make no sense, *except on the premise that he, Ruby, could be shown to have been the instigator of the Kennedy murder.*

Indeed, it would be preposterous to think that the crime which Ruby really did commit, i.e. the slaying of Oswald, could be used by anybody, in or out of the John Birch Society, to whip up popular feelings into a pogrom. Actually there was widespread applause for Ruby's action and one of his lawyers went so far as to suggest publicly that his client

should be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honour.

But suppose it could be proved - through skilful manipulation of the Jarnagin document* or by other means - that Ruby was at the origin of the conspiracy that led to be assassination of the President, then a mass hysteria culminating in a pogrom would not be inconceivable.

These are the fears that haunted Ruby, and they were intensified by his long imprisonment. He appears to have been, withal, a religious man, and the thought that his demonstrable involvement in the conspiracy that led to the murder of the President could bring about an extermination of the Jewish people preyed on his mind.

'Can you understand now in visualizing what happened,' he asked Warren, 'what powers, what momentum has been carried out to create this feeling of mass feeling against my people, against certain people that were against them prior to their power. That goes over your head, doesn't it?'

Warren: 'Well, I don't quite get the full significance of it, Mr. Ruby. I know what you feel about the John Birch Society.'

Ruby: 'Very powerful.'

Later on in his testimony, he again reverts to this theme, with added emphasis: '... Because right now, I want to tell you this, I am used as a scapegoat, and there is no greater weapon that you can use to create some falsehood about some of the Jewish faith, especially the terrible heinous crime such as the killing of President Kennedy. Now maybe something can be saved. It may not be too late, whatever happens, if our President, Lyndon Johnson, knew the truth about me. *But if I am eliminated, there won't be any way of knowing.*'

Once more, but still in vain, Ruby tries to get his message through to Warren:

'Right now, when I leave your presence now, I am the only one that can bring out the truth to our President who believes in righteousness and justice.* But he has been told, I am certain, that I was a part of a plot to assassinate the President.

* See *Oswald: The Truth*, Chapter 1.

* A year or so later, Ruby was to express distinctly different feelings towards President Johnson (see the following chapter).

I know your hands are tied; you are helpless.'

Warren's hands indeed were tied, though not perhaps the way Ruby saw it at that time.

After that, new horrible visions of his people being 'tortured and mutilated' (he uses the same expression twice) well up in Ruby's mind, filled to overflowing with a terrible guilt complex.

He also senses clearly what is in store for himself.

'I have been used for a purpose, and there will be a certain tragic occurrence happening if you don't take my testimony (in Washington, he means). . . You have lost me, Chief Justice Warren. . . I won't be around for you to come and question me again. . . You have a lost cause, Earl Warren. . . Well, you won't ever see me again, I tell you that.'

Ruby's premonition of violent death at the hands of his double-crossing fellow conspirators was well-founded and Chief Justice Warren bears a heavy responsibility for the disappearance, early in 1967, of this last surviving protagonist of the Dallas drama of November 1963.

But even Ruby, tough and experienced gangster as he was, probably could not have foreseen the subtly diabolical manner in which he was going to be liquidated. He probably expected to be 'shot while trying to escape', to be poisoned or hanged in his cell with a makeshift rope torn from a bedsheet (a favourite police method of suiciding embarrassing prisoners) or by some similar time-honoured method.

Instead, Ruby was to become the first person in medical history to die of instant cancer. The sequence of events alone tells the whole story.

On October 5, 1966, the Texas Court of Appeals at Austin reversed the death sentence that had been imposed on Ruby, on March 14, 1964, by Dallas Judge Joe R. Brown, and a new trial to be held in a different city was ordered. That was a double disaster for the conspirators who were now faced with the possibility not only of a desperate Ruby singing *in extremis* like a canary, but of also losing control of the judicial proceedings. Only in Dallas was Ruby in safe hands as far as the plotters were concerned. A trial held anywhere else could rip the whole fabric of the conspiracy apart.

And so Jack Ruby, on December 9, 1966, - exactly one day after he had learned that his new trial was going to be held in February or March 1967 at Wichita Falls, about 140 miles from Dallas - was stricken with a mysterious disease first diagnosed as a common cold, then as pneumonia and finally as generalized cancer.

For more than three years, with a death sentence hanging over his head for most of the time, Ruby had been as fit as a fiddle in the custody of Dallas Sheriff Bill Decker. At no time before December 9, had the prison doctor who visited him regularly, detected any flaw in Ruby's splendid health. But now, with a new trial in prospect in a different place, death quickly overtook the man who knew perhaps more than any other living person (with the possible exception of David Ferrie, then still totally unknown to the public at large) about the real background to the assassination. He passed away in the morning of January 3, 1967* - and another inconvenient trial was happily averted.

As always, my critics are likely to counter at this point with the challenge: 'Where is your evidence that Ruby was murdered?'

The evidence is there, plain to see for anyone with an open mind, but it is purely circumstantial, not tangible. (The people who arranged for Ruby's death, as they had previously arranged for the overt murders of President Kennedy, Patrolman Tippit and Lee Harvey Oswald, to say nothing of the 20-odd witnesses who have also been disposed of, weren't stupid enough to leave any palpable traces of what they had done.)

Artificially induced cancer may be an innovation in murder techniques, but its practicability is now firmly established. In the *Playboy* interview referring to above, Garrison again revealed that he shared my suspicions. One fascinating disclosure is that David Ferrie had taken a considerable interest in cancer. He had written a medical treatise on the subject,

* The highly suspicious circumstances of his death are discussed at some length in my French-language book *La vérité sur le cas de Jack Ruby*.

and he had carried out considerable research with a number of New Orleans doctors on how to induce cancer in mice. At one time he had had as many as 2,000 white mice running about his flat and his neighbours had complained. One of the doctors with whom he had collaborated, Doctor Mary Sherman, was found hacked to death with a knife in her flat in New Orleans after the assassination. Her murder has never been solved.

As Garrison correctly points out, Ferrie's experiments may have been purely theoretical and Doctor Sherman's killing may have been quite unconnected. But it is certainly interesting that Ruby died of cancer at a time when the conspirators would have found his death very convenient, and in view of the promptitude with which they acted to close Oswald's mouth, there is no reason to suppose that they would have shown much hesitancy in preventing Ruby from talking in much the same way.

Chapter 8

Whodunit

In a way, the Kennedy assassination resembles an Agatha Christie novel. First one person with an obvious compulsion to kill the prospective victim is introduced, then another with almost as strong a motive, and still another obviously predestined to be murderer and so on. Eventually, there are half a dozen people, all ready, willing and able to perpetrate the crime, but in the *dénouement* the culprit turns out to have been the pure-hearted maiden aunt, or the jolly cook, or the kindly family doctor - the one nobody would have suspected.

It is not generally known, and seldom remembered, but the fact of the matter is that in the first two hours or so after the shooting, while Oswald was still at large or had not yet been presumed to be the assassin, the *right wing*, not the Left was blamed for the crime even by observers and broadcasters in predominantly conservative Dallas.

The following testimony by Bernard Weissman - the young man who put in the *Dallas Morning News* that notorious, ominously black-bordered ad, 'Welcome Mr. Kennedy', which insulted the President on his arrival in town - tells the story.

Weissman (interrogated by Commission Counsel Albert E. Jenner, Jr.):

'Well, because the way it was right away, the announcers, even before it was ascertained that President Kennedy was dead, or that he had really been shot, [said] that it was a right-wing plot and so forth. . . Because, let's face it, the public feeling would suddenly be very anti-right-wing, and no telling what would happen if a mob got together and discovered him [Joe Grinnan].* They would tear him apart. 'Bill [Burley] and I were frightened to the point because

* Joe Grinnan, 'independent oil operator' in Dallas and coordinator of the John Birch Society in that city, raised from four other oilmen, and then handed over to Weissman, the \$ 1,462 needed to pay for the ad.

I knew about the ad. And I knew exactly what - at least I felt in my own mind I knew what people would believe. They would read the ad and so forth, and associate you with this thing, somehow, one way or another. . .'

Scared to death about the possible consequences their inflammatory ad might have for themselves, Weissman and his friends, Bill Burley and Larrie Schmidt, then went to a bar to drink beer and watch television. He relates:

'And we had been in the bar, I guess, about an hour when it came over that this patrolman Tippit had been shot, and they trapped some guy in a movie theater. And maybe half an hour later, it came out this fellow's name was Lee Harvey Oswald. This is the first time I ever heard the name.'

Jenner: 'What was said at that time?'

Weissman: 'By us?'

Jenner: 'Yes. When it was announced it was Lee Harvey Oswald.'

Weissman: 'We were relieved.'

Jenner: 'Anything said about it?'

Weissman: 'I don't recall. First, what was said, like I hope he is not a member of the Walker group - something like that - I hope he is not one of Walker's boys.** Because it is like a clique, and it is guilt by association from thereafter. So it came over later this guy was a Marxist. This was the same afternoon, I believe. It was found out this fellow was a Marxist. And then the announcers - they left the right-wing for a little while, and started going to the left, and I breathed a sigh of relief. . .'

Well he might. With Oswald in custody, the carefully prearranged plan of blaming the foul deed on a 'demented Marxist' could be smoothly carried out and the heat was taken off the embattled Right. President Johnson himself, at Love Field Airport, let it be known that he'd better be sworn in quickly, and hurry back to Washington because this could be a 'worldwide conspiracy', meaning of course a Communist one.

** The reference is to Major-General Edwin A. Walker, US Army, ret.

And at police headquarters in Dallas, Assistant District Attorney William F. Alexander, a widely known right-winger, when asked by reporters if he had evidence that Oswald was the assassin, shouted back: 'Yes, he is a God damned Communist!' And that was that.

But it had been a close call for Weissman and his friends, Larrie and Bill, three former GI's who had served in Germany under General Walker, had been indoctrinated by him in the spirit of the John Birch Society, and had later rejoined him in Dallas to help him carry on the good work of the 'National Indignation Convention'.

Weissman, his friends Schmidt and Burley, and their financial angel, Joe Grinnan, having conspired to assail President Kennedy, the morning of his arrival in Dallas, with the most vicious and subversive advertisement one can imagine, one that moreover was enclosed by a prophetically funeral black border, were self-evident *prima facie* suspects in the assassination - or were they?

The trouble is that the whole thing is too obvious, too pat. No prospective murderer in his right senses - and no one has yet suggested that these four gentlemen were all stark raving mad - advertises his evil intentions. As Weissman justly remarked to Jenner, with that ad to their discredit and assassination following right after, he and his friends were practically earmarked for lynching. If a mob had gotten together and discovered them, they would have been torn apart, limb by limb.

Add to it the telltale fact that Weissman bears a conspicuously Jewish name - and you get the right picture. He, too, had been used by the real conspirators to lay a false trail and to serve as a lightning-rod, if needed.

For, the masterminds of the conspiracy really left nothing to chance.

Suppose the worst had come to the worst: Oswald, with not a shred of real evidence against him has been reluctantly acquitted even by a Dallas jury, and Ruby, though convicted of conspiracy to murder has been able to prove in court that he only meant to do away with Connally, but never meant to harm the President.

What now? In such an emergency, a third scapegoat would be needed - and Weissman would make a perfect stand-in for Rubenstein. Alternatively, of course, Weissman might have been implicated with Ruby. There were no doubt others apart from Mark Lane's informant who had witnessed the meeting between Ruby, Weissman and Tippit at the Carousel Club. And one has to remember that Tippit was killed when heading for Ruby's apartment.

That funereal ad in the *Dallas Morning News* was just a diversion, I feel sure. The wealthy oilmen who paid for it had something more practical in mind than to offer gratuitous insult to a President already sentenced to death and about to be executed. The most conspicuous word in the long text of that full-page ad, and the one word that did make sense was 'Weissman'.

Weissman, the Jew. Assassin-in-reserve.

Much the same goes also for General Walker, I now believe. I've changed my mind about him, I admit, as I have done about Weissman, and for the same reason. His background, his activities before and on the day of the assassination and his well-established reputation as a rabid rabble-rouser out for blood all mark him too clearly as a potential suspect in the first degree. Too pat, too obvious.

General Walker, however, himself a topranking member of the Dallas oligarchy, and an acknowledged leader of the John Birch Society,* is in a different category from Bernard Weissman, the unemployed and penniless carpet salesman who went to Dallas to sell rugs and never sold any. It is almost inconceivable that he, too, should have been used as a pawn by the conspirators.

What is more, General Walker went to the limit in provocation. From the way he behaved, one simply couldn't help associating him with the conspiracy - as I, for one, did in my first book on the subject, *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*

If he didn't exactly point an accusing finger at himself, he

* At one point during his interrogation by Chief Justice Warren (see preceding chapter) Ruby described General Walker as 'one of the top men' of the John Birch Society in Dallas.

certainly made himself conspicuous as a potential assassin.

To begin with, General Walker had a perfect motive for wanting to kill President Kennedy whom he regarded as his sworn enemy. He had been forced to go into retirement in 1961 after the President had learned that Walker was systematically indoctrinating the troops under his command, in Germany, with Birchite propaganda.

And in September 1962, when Federal troops swarmed into Mississippi to stop the race riots at Oxford University, General Walker had been arrested as a ringleader, charged with sedition and subsequently committed - briefly - to a psychiatric institution.

When Adlai Stevenson visited Dallas, on October 24, 1963, he was spat upon and assaulted by Walker's cohorts parading as the 'National Indignation Convention'.

Walker and his like-minded aide, Colonel L. Robert Castor, also made inflammatory speeches against the Kennedy Administration at meetings of anti-Castro Cuban groups in the Dallas area.

On the eve of the Kennedy visit to Dallas, General Walker really outdid himself. In front of his home at 4011 Turtle Creek, he flew his three flags upside down - an international distress signal. After the assassination, and in defiance of the half-staff mourning period that had been proclaimed, Walker promptly flew all of his flags right side up again - at full staff.

Walker also had printed 5,000 copies of a handbill marked 'Wanted for Treason' which, in the words of the Warren Report, 'bore a reproduction of a front and profile photograph of the President and set forth a series of inflammatory charges against him.'

These handbills, openly describing President Kennedy as a traitor, were made to resemble the 'Wanted for Murder' poster the FBI uses in its hunt for the 'Ten Most Wanted' criminals. This similarity is of itself full of dire meaning, for the men thus profiled in an FBI poster are considered highly dangerous thugs who at the first sign of resistance will be gunned down mercilessly.

General Walker, thus, all but openly called for the assassination of President Kennedy and rejoiced over it afterwards.

It is hard to imagine anything else he could have done to attract suspicion to himself and his troops. And yet -

Again, the whole thing is simply too pat, too obvious, even too obtrusive. It is one thing to insult and harass a President and to incite mob action against him. It is quite a different thing to shoot him down in cold blood, in an elaborate ambush as happened in Dealey Plaza.

What, then, was General Walker's role in the drama, if any?*

It is hard to say with any degree of certainty, because it is a truly baffling case. I used to think that General Walker, as a top military man, a notorious right-wing extremist and a Kennedy-hater of the lunatic fringe, must surely have been one of the organizers of the Dealey Plaza ambush. I no longer think so, mainly because Garrison has convincingly demonstrated that it was a *CIA* production.

However, I still consider it possible that Walker was marginally involved.

One possible explanation of his provocative conduct could be that the general offered himself as a convenient scapegoat to the conspirators, in case the Oswald Hoax went wrong, and the Jewish diversion didn't work out either, confident that no Dallas Jury would ever convict him, anyway.

It is more likely, or so it seems to me, that General Walker was not aware of the fact that some of his friends and fellow-Birchers in the Dallas oligarchy were planning to *act* while he was posturing. Seeing himself as the great hero of the American Right, and having already created in Dallas the perfect climate for violence, the general perhaps felt he just had to put on another show of bravado when Kennedy came to town. And then he, too, was doublecrossed by his friends who had gunmen ready where the general merely wanted to demonstrate.

* The Warren Report, in the most implausible manner, assigns to General Walker another, passive, role in the case, alleging that Oswald had also tried to kill him, a few months before the Kennedy assassination. This preposterous story, cooked up by Marina and her 'business advisers', is fully discussed in my book *Marina Oswald*.

That the John Birch Society was involved in the plot, alongside of the Dallas oligarchy, the Dallas Police, the CIA and some disloyal elements in the FBI and the Secret Service, I am convinced. But it is a big group and cannot be implicated collectively any more than the Dallas Police can be - or the CIA for that matter. Some of its top leaders - though probably not General Walker - were in on the plot, and helped to select the Minutemen and the Cuban adventures who did the actual shooting while the bulk of the membership was not, of course, involved.

Jack Ruby, apparently drawing on the prison grapevine as his source of information, belatedly developed a theory of his own about the powers behind the assassination.

In Chapter 12 ('Jones Buys Ruby Letter') of his book *Forgive my Grief*, published in 1966, Penn Jones Jr., the doughty Texas country editor of whom I said in the Foreword to *Oswald: The Truth* that he had exhibited more courage than all the cowboys of his state put together, relates the matter in these forthright terms:

'A new development has recently been announced in New York. On January 31, 1966, one of the leading autograph dealers in the world, Charles Hamilton of New York, sold two letters allegedly written by Jack Ruby. The letters were said to have been smuggled from the Dallas jail. Sale was held at the Waldorf-Astoria Astor Gallery, and this editor bought one letter for \$ 950.00.

'The first paragraph of the notice on p. 25 of the catalogue reads:

'106 (KENNEDY AND JOHNSON). JACK RUBY, murderer of LEE HARVEY OSWALD.' A.L. (unsigned) in pencil, 33 full pages, 16 mo. Dallas Jail, 1965 - (400.00).

"Astounding confession of international importance, pinpointing LYNDON B. JOHNSON as the real murderer of JOHN F. KENNEDY and the tool of a Fascist conspiracy to liquidate the Jews! Neatly written by Ruby to a fellow prisoner on slips torn from a memo pad, this letter was smuggled out of the Dallas Jail and is unpublished in any form. The ramifications of the letters are so many, touching on such sensitive questions as the assassination of Kennedy and Os-

wald, the conduct of Dallas and government officials and the Warren Commission, that extensive space is given here to excerpts. . .

"To start my story off, they found some very clever means and ways to trick me and which will be used later as evidence to show the American people that I was part of the conspiracy in the assassination of (the) president, and I was used to silence Oswald. I walked into a trap the moment I walked down that ramp Sunday morning. This was the spot where they could frame the Jew and that way, all of his people will be blamed as being Communists, this is what they were waiting for. They alone had planned the killing, by they I mean Johnson and others. I guess that is why Oswald was able to escape the building as he did, because they wanted him to escape. That is why there has been so much contradiction and confusion as to the identity of the rifle used, etc.

"... read the book *TEXAS LOOKS AT LYNDON* and you may learn quite a bit about Johnson and how he has fooled everyone. . . about the author Walter Haley,* they no doubt have gotten rid of him . . . He wrote the way Johnson had beat people on various deals. In all the history of the U.S., never has a president been elected that has the background of Johnson. Believe me, compared to him, I am a Saint. . ."

"The letter purchased by this editor is similar in its contents. . ."

* It is clear that Ruby had not read this book but had heard about it from somebody else in prison. For, the correct title of the book is *A Texan Looks at Lyndon*, and the author's correct name is J. Evetts Haley. It was published in 1964 by the Palo Duro Press, Canyon, Texas (the author's own firm).

Ironically, Mr. Haley, himself an ultraconservative rightwinger, is a great friend of General Edwin Walker whom Ruby considers the power behind the drive to exterminate the Jews.

Chapter 9

The Dealey Plaza Ambush

The core of the Kennedy Murder Fraud is exposed by the topography of the assassination site.

As early as November 23, 1963, *The New York Times* accurately described the Texas School Book Depository as an '*Ambush Building Chosen with Care*'. What the paper did not care to tell its readers, though, was that Lee H. Oswald, the alleged assassin, did not of his own initiative choose the TSBD as his place of work, but was *planted* there by a false friend (Ruth Paine); nor did *The Times* care to point out that the employment of Oswald at the TSBD took place about six weeks before any member of the general public in Dallas could know, or even guess that the presidential motorcade would pass in the vicinity of the Book Depository. All of which logically rules out Oswald as the one who chose the ambush building with care.

There was not only an ambush building but also, and more importantly still, an *ambush itinerary* in the choice of which Oswald, again, could not have had any say. As early as June 1964 my book *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* called attention to the 'self-betraying' double detour which brought the parade at a conveniently slow pace not only within easy range of the TSBD window but of a number of other suitable sniper's positions. The Warren Commission, instead of relentlessly pursuing the all-important question of who was responsible for that risk-studded itinerary, chose to quibble about traffic technicalities. With plenty of charts and exhibits, the Warren Report makes the point that the chosen route was entirely natural and 'appropriate'.

'To reach the Trade Mart from Main Street the (Secret Service) agents decided to use the Stemmons Freeway (Route No. 77), the most direct route,' the Commission says. 'The only practical way for westbound traffic on Main Street to reach the Northbound lanes of the Stemmons Freeway is via

Elm Street, which Route No. 77 traffic is instructed to follow in this part of the city.' (See Commission Exhibit No. 2113).

'Elm Street was to be reached from Main by turning right at Houston going one block north and then turning left into Elm. On this last portion of the journey, only five minutes from the Trade Mart, the President's motorcade would pass the Texas School Book Depository Building on the northwest corner of Houston and Elm Streets. The building overlooks Dealey Plaza, an attractively landscaped triangle of 3 acres.'

The Commission's explanations here are somewhat less than candid and wholly misleading. The fact of the matter is (and Exhibit 2113 shows this clearly) that normally traffic bound for Stemmons Freeway and the Dallas-Forth Worth Turnpike moves, in that part of the city, *all the way* along Route 77, i.e. along Elm, not Main Street. Had the motorcade followed that route, it would have passed the TSBD at normal speed and, by the same token 'Oswald' would have found it all but impossible to hit his mark accurately.

But, the Report tells us, the planners had decided not to use Elm Street for the main portion of the downtown part of the motorcade, 'because Main Street offered better vantage points for spectators.'

This point can be argued by anyone familiar with the aspect of both streets. However, that is not the real issue. What matters is that traffic moving west along Main Street, and headed for the Trade Mart or the Airport, normally would not take the access road to Stemmons Freeway at this point, but would proceed for a few blocks and then turn right into the broad Industrial Boulevard which runs roughly parallel to the Freeway and rejoins the latter at almost exactly the spot where the Trade Mart is located.

What the Commission chose to overlook, or at any rate failed to tell its audience, is that westward traffic is normally very heavy along both Elm and Main Street, which run parallel. *If it truly were a normal traffic rule* for cars moving westward on Main in the direction of the Trade Mart, the Airport or the Turnpike, to turn right at Houston, go one block north and then turn left on Elm - as the presidential motorcade did - *the inevitable result would be a permanent*

jam of monster proportions. For then the heavy flow of cars coming down Main Street would have to merge with the equally heavy flow down Elm Street at the Book Depository corner. Actually, Elm Street traffic normally turns into Stemmons Freeway and Main Street traffic goes on to Industrial Boulevard, which allows for a fairly smooth operation all day long.

Moreover, with the President's safety at stake in a turbulent and clearly hostile city, priority should certainly have been given to elementary considerations of security, in charting the 'appropriate' itinerary, rather than to solicitude for the provision of 'vantage points' for spectators.

The principal shortcoming of the Warren Commission, in the matter, is that it completely failed to look into the question whether the itinerary could have been charted by inside conspirators precisely in such a manner as to provide the best opportunities for a deadly ambush yet at the same time leave room for specious arguments about traffic conditions. Isn't it natural, when you plan to assassinate the President, to make allowance for all kinds of pretexts and subterfuges that would seem to explain the treacherous arrangements made?

If the Commission really had wanted to find the truth, it would have tried to visualize, at least as a theoretical possibility, what undoubtedly was the real sequence of events:

First, the decision was made to use the President's visit to Texas for setting up a trap in which he could be killed effectively by *crossfire* (A year before, President Charles de Gaulle of France was to have been assassinated in the same manner, but escaped through sheer luck and the quick response of his bodyguards).

Next, persons thoroughly familiar with the topography of Dallas suggested that Dealey Plaza with its tall buildings overlooking a wide open space, its Triple Underpass, its arcades and its car parks hidden by trees, bushes and fences presented all the features for an ideal death trap.

Then, in the third place, an itinerary had to be found that would seem to justify leading the motorcade right into this trap.

That this is, indeed, the correct interpretation of events becomes readily apparent from a searching review of what the

Warren Report, William Manchester's *The Death of a President* and authoritative press reports have had to say about the making of the fateful travel arrangements.

To begin with the Warren Report, it states: 'An important purpose of the President's visit to Dallas was to speak at a luncheon given by business and civic leaders. The White House staff informed the Secret Service that the President would arrive and depart from Dallas' Love Field; that a motorcade through the downtown area of Dallas to the luncheon site should be arranged; and that following the luncheon the President would return to the airport by the most direct route. Accordingly, it was important to determine the luncheon site as quickly as possible, so that security could be established at the site and the motorcade route selected.'

Two observations are in order. In the first place, this paragraph conveys the impression that the Secret Service was informed by the White House staff at one and the same time that the President would a) arrive and depart from Love Field; b) that a motorcade to the luncheon site should be arranged; and c) that the return to the airport would be by the most direct route. This is inexact and indeed misleading, for the decision to hold a motorcade was not made until Wednesday 20 November (see below), six days after the luncheon site had been selected and five days after Winston Lawson, the representative of the White House detail of the Secret Service, had arrived in Dallas to check arrangements from the viewpoint of security. Instruction (b), then, cannot have been given to the Secret Service at the same time as (a) and (c).

And two, why was it important only to establish security at the luncheon site and not along all of the motorcade route?

The Warren Report then goes on to say 'On November 4, Gerald A. Behn, agent in charge of the White House detail, asked Sorrels* to examine three potential sites for the luncheon. One building, Market Hall, was unavailable for November 22. The second, The Women's Building at the State Fair Grounds, was a one-storey building with few entrances

and easy to make secure, but it lacked necessary food-handling facilities and had certain unattractive features, including a low ceiling with exposed conduits and beams. The third possibility, the Trade Mart, a handsome new building with all the necessary facilities, presented security problems. It had numerous entrances, several tiers of balconies surrounding the central court where the luncheon would be held, and several catwalks crossing the court at each level. On November 4, Sorrels told Behn he believed security difficulties at the Trade Mart could be overcome by special precautions. Lawson also evaluated the security hazards at the Trade Mart on November 13. Kenneth O'Donnell (special assistant to the President who, according to the Warren Report 'acted as coordinator for the trip' - J. J.) made the final decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart; Behn so notified Lawson on November 14.'

Note how quickly Sorrels made up his mind that security hazards at the Trade Mart could be overcome. The same day he is asked by the head of the White House detail 'to examine three potential sites for the luncheon' Sorrels expresses the view that a large building with numerous features presenting security difficulties could be made safe 'by special precautions'. This is but one of several instances in which those locally responsible for making the arrangements, i.e. the Dallas officials and 'civic leaders,' expressed a preference for the Trade Mart above all other possibilities. The Warren Commission, as usual, saw nothing suspicious in this subtle insistence on the Trade Mart as the most convenient luncheon site. Yet this choice alone could have led to the selection of a motorcade route that would pass in the vicinity of the Texas School Book Depository. In the case of the Women's Building which is located in an entirely different part of the city, it would have been difficult, indeed, to justify a route leading past the Book Depository even in the eyes of a Warren Commission.

William Manchester who, as everyone knows, was able to draw on an exclusive source of information, the Kennedys, paints a very different picture from that presented by the Commission. He blames the selection of the Trade Mart on petty considerations of prestige put forward by John Connally,

* Forrest V. Sorrels, special agent in charge of the Dallas Office of the Secret Service.

the Governor of Texas, who allegedly was preoccupied with plans for humiliating a political rival, Senator Ralph Yarborough.

'Connally, meanwhile, had been busy spinning intricate webs,' Manchester writes. 'Jerry Bruno, advance man for the Democratic National Committee, learned of one Connally scheme to put Senator Yarborough in his place. *The details are important because they involved the choice of the site where the President would speak in Dallas and, as a consequence, the motorcade route he would take.*

'There were three major choices: the Women's Building, the Market Hall and the Trade Mart. *Bruno preferred the Women's Building*, but it was rather drab and its low-ceilinged structure made it unsuitable for one of Connally's schemes. In Dallas Connally wanted a two-tiered top table. The President, the Vice-President and the Governor would sit at the higher one. Lesser officials - such as the state's senior senator Yarborough - would be relegated to the lower.

'It was within Bruno's power to make a final decision on the spot. Had he insisted on the Women's Building, the Dallas motorcade would not have passed beneath the Texas School Book Depository.'

'Because he (Bruno) hesitated the matter remained unsettled,' Manchester goes on to write without bothering to explain what happened. If Bruno had full power to make the final decision on the spot, why did he 'hesitate'? And, if he could have insisted on his choice, the Women's Building, but failed to do so, is it not self-evident that he had encountered opposition - an opposition so strong that he could not overrule it? And, again, if Bruno, as the original version has it, now is consumed by remorse for having failed to insist, does that not suggest that there was a strong conflict about the issue?

'The Secret Service regarded all three sites as acceptable,' Manchester says. The contradiction with the Warren Report is only on the surface, for we have already seen that Sorrels overcame the apparent security difficulties at the Trade Mart with remarkable speed. Now, to quote Manchester further:

'The issue was bucked up to the White House, where the policy was still to appease Connally. On November 14, Ken-

neth O'Donnell opted for the Trade Mart, though the two-tiered top table was rejected.'

This paragraph, of course, makes no sense whatsoever. If Connally really preferred the Trade Mart to the Women's Building, then it was, according to Manchester himself, because the former was suitable and the latter unsuitable for the Governor's pet scheme of installing a two-tiered top table. And if the policy at the White House was to appease Connally, then it was essential to give him what he wanted: the two-tiered table. As long as this scheme was rejected, Connally no longer had any reason to insist on the Trade Mart. This version, then is obviously nothing more than a subterfuge to cover up the fact that O'Donnell gave to the Dallas leaders what they wanted - for far less respectable reasons than Connally's considerations of prestige. They wanted the Trade Mart, because on it depended the selection of a motorcade route that would lead into the predestined death trap - Dealey Plaza.

In parentheses, Manchester adds to the foregoing: 'The Warren Commission reported that the luncheon site was selected by the Secret Service with O'Donnell's approval. This is incorrect. *The decision was a political decision, made by politicians. Bruno was among the witnesses whom the Commission did not summon.*'

What does Manchester mean to convey by the first of the last two sentences? Who are the 'politicians' who made the decision? Kennedy? O'Donnell? (Remember, he has stated before that the decision was 'bucked up' to the White House). Or Connally, after all? 'The Governor was content,' Manchester writes. Content with what - the rejection of his little scheme? All that makes no sense and is manifestly designed to hide the identity of the people who really made the fateful decision.

More illuminating is Manchester's statement that 'Bruno was among the witnesses whom the Commission did not summon.' A glance at the official list of witnesses who testified before the Commission confirms this - and highlights one of the most scandalous sins of omission the seven sages have been guilty of. For, it is perfectly clear that Bruno played a key

role in the arrangements that preceded the assassination. The way he wanted it would have been the safe way and the President would still be alive. But somebody overrode him - somebody influential enough to push aside a man who had full power to make the final decision on the spot! Who was that opponent of Bruno's, why was he so insistent on the Trade Mart, and how did he manage to make his views prevail over those of the plenipotentiary?

Had the Warren Commission really aimed at establishment of the truth, it could not have failed to ask these questions and to insist on satisfactory answers. Instead, it simply dodged this essential issue by not calling a witness of first-rate importance. Can there be any excuse for such behaviour?

Let us turn now to a third important source of information on this issue, one to which I had already called attention in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*, but which assumes increased significance in the light of the above information gleaned from the Warren Report and the Manchester book.

As early as November 29, 1963, *The New York Herald Tribune* came out with a remarkably informative dispatch from Washington entitled: *Dallas Ride: Questions in New Facts* which is worth quoting at some length:

'President Kennedy's triumphant motorcade through Fort Worth last Friday morning and his even more exhilarating but ultimately fatal motorcade through Dallas at noontime were events written into the schedule in the last days before his death, the *Herald Tribune* learned yesterday.

'They were events the Secret Service could not have counted on when it sent its advance man to the Dallas-Fort Worth area a week before the trip to make plans for the President's security.'

Compare these two paragraphs to the already-cited passage from the Warren Report which begins with the words 'An important purpose...' The contradiction is evident. The Warren Commission presented the matter in such a way that the impression was created as though plans for a motorcade had already been determined. This determination, according to the Report, took place on November 14, a day after the advance agent, Lawson, had 'evaluated the security hazards at

the Trade Mart.' According to the *Herald Tribune*, however, Lawson arrived in Dallas a week before the President's arrival, which would make it the 15th of November and *he did not know then that plans for a motorcade existed*. Since the *Herald Tribune* story was based on unimpeachable authority, as we shall see, and was published before the Warren Commission had even been set up, it is clear that the Commission deliberately twisted already established facts in order to conceal a crucial element pointing towards conspiracy at a high level.

'Raymond E. Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, told this newspaper the decision to hold the Fort Worth motorcade was made in the '24 to 36 hours' before the President's arrival in the city the night before his assassination' the *Herald Tribune* dispatch continued.

'Robert B. Cullum, president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and director of the Dallas Citizens Council, said the decision to hold the fatal motorcade was made 'two or three days' before the President arrived.

'Both men were active in making arrangements for the visit, dealing with the White House representatives and Secret Service men making the advance arrangements.

'Mr. Cullum said he dealt with a Winston Lawson of the Secret Service making the arrangements... Mr. Cullum said Mr. Lawson... arrived in Dallas to make the security arrangements one week before the President arrived' - *that is several days before the decision to hold the motorcade was made*.

To recapitulate: November 14, 1963: The final decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart is made in Washington and is communicated to the Dallas authorities and the Secret Service bureau in that city. (And, on the night of November 14, that conspiratorial, two-hour meeting between Jack Ruby, Police Officer J. D. Tippit and Bernard Weissman took place at the Carousel Club!)

November 15: Winston Lawson, advance agent of the Secret Service (White House detail) arrives in Dallas to supervise security arrangements there and in Fort Worth. He does not know yet that motorcades are planned in both cities.

Lawson, on arrival, contacts the presidents of the two Chambers of Commerce, Raymond E. Buck and Robert B. Cullum, both of whom are 'active' in making arrangements for the presidential visit. The latter is also director of the all-powerful Dallas Citizens Council which - this is a matter of common knowledge - has ruled that city for decades after the manner of ancient oligarchies. The man behind the throne of the Citizens Council is oil magnate H.L. Hunt, as has been explained before. Smell a rat?

To go back to the Herald Tribune: 'Neither Mr. Buck nor Mr. Cullum could say definitely who made the decision to stage the motorcades. "The motorcade development was just one of a consensus among all concerned," Mr. Buck said.' (*Consensus*. The favorite term of Lyndon B. Johnson, the one he has always used to justify his own decisions! - J.J.) 'Prior to Wednesday we thought there would be no motorcade. On Thursday we were advised by the White House representatives that there would be. I would say that the President made the decision.'

This last statement is undoubtedly correct in the sense that Kennedy must have agreed to the proposal to hold a motorcade, otherwise it could not have taken place. But who really proposed it? Who talked Kennedy into it? How was this done? *The Herald Tribune* gives a hint:

'Mr. Cullum said the Dallas parade resulted from a feeling that not enough citizens of the city would get to see the President. The Trade Mart luncheon, which was to be sponsored by the Dallas Citizens Council... the Dallas Assembly and the Southwest Research Institute. (Sentence left hanging in the air by the H.-T.-J.J.)

'While the luncheon was for 2,600 people, it was an invitation affair,' Mr. Cullum said. 'There was a feeling that the people of Dallas - more than could be invited - should have the opportunity to see the President. The President, as we understood it, had a desire to see the people. When this desire on the part of the people and on the part of White House representatives was expressed, we did not feel it was our prerogative to say no.'

Note the suspiciously cautious wording of that statement.

There is 'a feeling' that more people wanted to see the President than could be invited to the luncheon. Who tested that feeling and how? It is also 'understood' that the President 'had a desire to see the people'.

The Citizens Council, it would appear from Mr. Cullum's remarks, really had nothing to do with the motorcade project; it just felt it could not stand in the way of the combined desires of the people and the President. That would have been a misuse of prerogative, says Mr. Cullum.

As a matter of fact, the *Herald Tribune* goes on to belabour this point in a subsequent paragraph: 'One irony in the situation was that the Citizens Council leaders, who represent the power structure in the city, favoured a direct trip by the President from Love Field to the Trade Mart and back to the airport after the speech. . . "But we're not taking any holier-than-thou attitude on the motorcade hindsight," Mr. Cullum said'.

If that is true, then the question most urgently arises: Who, with an influence even stronger than that of the Citizens Council, prevailed upon the organizers of the Dallas trip, in the last two or three days before the President's arrival, to include in the arrangements the 'Irregular U-shape' (*Herald Tribune*) motorcade route from the airport into the downtown area and then back to the Trade Mart?

'He (Cullum) could not identify the Dallas individuals with whom Mr. Lawson and a White House representative on the scene spoke in planning the route,' the *Herald Tribune* went on to say.

Why couldn't he? Doesn't the director of the Citizens Council 'represent the power structure in the city?' And he doesn't know what goes on in such an important matter? That is an obvious evasion. Mr. Cullum doesn't want to identify the 'Dallas individuals' who planned the route, for we are getting here to the heart of the conspiracy and those unnamed citizens were in the thick of it.

The final paragraph of the *Herald Tribune* story is perhaps the most revealing and most disturbing of all: 'The motorcade arrangements came so late in the planning that Texas Governor John B. Connally jr., who accompanied the

President on the short plane trip from Fort Worth to Dallas was not aware of it.'

There you have it - and let it sink in well. Not even Connally knew where the motorcade, which set out immediately after the plane's arrival from Fort Worth, would be going. Yet Lee Harvey Oswald, a small man in a big office building on the outskirts of town, is supposed to have known! He is even supposed to have known the motorcade route the day before, since he went out to Irving to get his gun - according to the Warren Report - on Thursday afternoon!

I had already pointed out the absurdity of this official assumption in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* but the Warren Commission, forever anxious to close its eyes to the truth, chose to ignore it. Since then, the testimony of a ranking Dallas FBI official, James P. Hosty jr., the agent entrusted by his Bureau with the task of keeping an eye on the movements of Lee H. Oswald, has strikingly confirmed the early, tell-tale revelation by the *Herald-Tribune*.

'Agent Hosty testified that he was fully aware of the pending Presidential visit to Dallas' the Warren Report states. 'He recalled that the special agent in charge of the Dallas office of the FBI, J. Gordon Shanklin, had discussed the President's visit on several occasions, including the regular biweekly conference on the morning of November 22. . .

'Hosty testified that he did not know until the evening of Thursday, November 21, that there was to be a motorcade, however, and never realized that the motorcade would pass the Texas School Book Depository. He testified that he did not read the newspaper story describing the motorcade route in detail, since he was interested only in the fact that the motorcade was coming up Main Street, 'where maybe I could watch it if I had a chance'.

Here the Warren Report is really stretching credibility to the breaking point. Imagine the situation. The President is coming to town and all the law enforcement agencies are on the alert. On the very morning of his arrival, a briefing is held at FBI headquarters and a top agent - Hosty was on the second echelon of the Dallas bureau - emerges from it ignorant of the motorcade arrangements, although his duty is

precisely to keep suspects out of harm's way! He, the agent watching Oswald, does not know what the latter is fully conversant with, that is, that the President's car is going to pass beneath the Book Depository, within convenient shooting distance. . .

The whole thing is such a transparent web of lies, subterfuges, fabrications and distortions one really wonders how anybody in his right mind who ever studied the matter can have been taken in by it.

For the Warren Commission, it would have been easy to cut through this web of false pretences. All it would have had to do was to stage a general confrontation of all the persons known to have had a hand in the making of the three crucial decisions that led to the Dealy Plaza ambush: (a) the decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart, rather than at the Women's Building; (b) the decision that 'came so late in the planning' to hold a motorcade through the downtown area; and (c) the decision to lead the motorcade past the Texas School Book Depository, unbeknown to the occupants of the presidential car.

As we have seen, the following persons were definitely active in making at least some of these arrangements:

1. *Jerry Bruno* - Of him, the above-cited *Herald Tribune* dispatch says, confirming in essence the information already quoted from the Manchester book: 'Mr. Cullum reported that detailed plans for the Presidential trip were not made until two weeks before the visit when Jerry Bruno of the Democratic National Committee, representing P. Kenneth O'Donnell, the late President's appointments secretary and handler of political affairs, came to town.'

2. *Robert B. Cullum* - director of the Dallas Citizens Council, whose prominent part in making the arrangements has already been discussed.

3. *Raymond E. Buck* - president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, who was active in arranging the prior motorcade through that city.

4. *Kenneth O'Donnell* - one of Kennedy's most trusted aides, whose actions both before and after the Dallas tragedy are open to suspicion (among other things, he was responsible

for the outrageous kidnapping of the dead President's body from the lawful jurisdiction of the Dallas County Medical Examiner, as is described in detail in my book *Oswald: The Truth*).

5. Secret Service agents *Forrest V. Sorrels* and *Winston Lawson*.

6. FBI bureau chief *J. Gordon Shanklin*.

7. Dallas Chief of Police *Jesse E. Curry* and his top aides.

In this connection, the following paragraph from the Warren Report is also worth quoting:

'After the selection of the Trade Mart as the luncheon site, Lawson and Sorrels met with Dallas Chief of Police Jesse E. Curry, Assistant Chief Charles Batchelor, Deputy Chief N.T. Fisher, and several other command officers to discuss details of the motorcade and possible routes. The route was further reviewed by Lawson and Sorrels with Assistant Chief Batchelor and members of the local host committee on November 15.'

As we have seen, two members of the host committee for the Dallas-Fort Worth area, Messrs. Buck and Cullum, have specifically stated that the decision to hold motorcades in the twin cities was made 'in the 24 to 36 hours' (Buck) or 'two or three days' (Cullum) before the President's arrival. These unqualified statements glaringly expose the fallacy of the Commission's contention that the route was 'reviewed' by Lawson, Sorrels, Batchelor and others as early as November 15. The Commission is obviously lying here and it does so for the manifest purpose of shielding the responsible police and Secret Service officials who together with members of the Dallas Citizens Council plotted the fateful route and put it into effect at so late an hour that no objection could be raised by honest officials who were not privy to the conspiracy. So late, indeed, that even the occupants of the presidential car did not know where they were going.

'The police officials agreed that the *route recommended by Sorrels* was the proper one and did not express a belief that any other route might be better. On November 18, Sorrels and Lawson drove over the selected route with Batchelor and other police officers, verifying that it could be

transversed within 45 minutes. Representatives of the local host committee and the White House staff were advised by the Secret Service of the actual route on the afternoon of November 18.'

Which actual route? As I have set forth and documented in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?*, the only map of the motorcade route published before the assassination appeared in the *Dallas Morning News* on November 22 and it showed an itinerary that led straight from Main Street to the Underpass without the double detour towards the Book Depository that was actually taken by the parade. All other references in the press, before the fateful day, were vague and confusing. Accordingly, nobody in the general public, least of all Oswald, who seldom read newspapers and displayed little interest in current affairs, could have known for sure that the motorcade would pass by the TSBD. Only a very small circle of top-ranking Dallas Police officials, Secret Service men and members of the Citizens Council knew the *exact* itinerary, because *they* had planned it - as a trap.

Most significantly, the Warren Commission also failed to summon the two 'civic leaders' that had been most active in making the arrangements, Messrs. Buck and Cullum. Evidently, the Commission did not want to hear from their lips, in sworn testimony, what these gentlemen had already told the *New York Herald Tribune* and which, as we have seen, is in flagrant contrast with the 'findings' of the Commission.

Bruno, Buck, Cullum. Three prominent personalities in the know who could have guided the Warren Commission to the truth, had they been called to testify and subjected to a searching, relentless inquiry. Three personalities the Commission conspicuously ignored, although their statements were already in the record. Nothing could demonstrate more cogently that the Commission, far from aiming at the truth, as it hypocritically contended, was in reality determined to suppress it. The failure to summon these three key witnesses was no oversight, anymore than the preposterous findings of the Commission concerning Oswald can have been due to innocent error.

Its actions, on the contrary, are proof what the Warren

Commission - for so-called reasons of state - deliberately shielded the real assassins of President Kennedy. Thus, individually and collectively the members of the Commission made themselves *accessories after the fact* in the Crime of the Century.

District Attorney Jim Garrison in New Orleans has vowed that he will prosecute all accessories after the fact in the assassination of President Kennedy. If he keeps his word, he will have to arrest some day Earl Warren, Allen Dulles, John J. McCloy and all the other members and counsel of a Commission which condoned the murder of the President, covered the tracks of his assassins and connived in the worst travesty of justice in our time - the sacrifice of the innocent scapegoat Oswald.

Chapter 10

How Kennedy was Lured into the Death Trap

Except for the reckless, death-defying bravado of fanatics who attack at close quarters with a bomb, a gun or a knife, the assassination of a President of the United States can succeed only in a propitious environment. It can succeed only as a result of a conspiracy which includes key members of all protective organs, the local police, the FBI and the Secret Service. Indeed, the most powerful, yet least considered argument in defence of Lee Harvey Oswald is simply that he was not in a position to neutralize the security apparatus which normally protects a president. Oswald had no control of the Texas School Depository, a huge building swarming with more than a hundred people and one that by its location, shape and other features was predestined to attract the attention of the Secret Service.

Even the Warren Commission has lamely conceded that the *TSBD* was an apparent danger site that could have been easily identified. 'An attempt to cover only the most obvious points of possible ambush along the route,' says the Warren Report, '... might well have included the... Depository Building.' Normally, this would have happened, for it is basic to the functioning of the Secret Service to spot such danger sites and render them harmless. Anybody planning single-handedly to shoot from such a building at the President would have been a stupid dare-devil doomed to certain failure.

For the plot to kill President Kennedy to have a maximum chance of success, it was necessary to draw him out of an environment where he was ordinarily well-protected, such as Washington, and lead him to a place where the security apparatus could be effectively neutralized. Dallas was just such a place, for there the police force was in the hands of an organisation (The Citizens Council) determined to get rid of the liberal, progressive, peace-minded Chief Executive. In all of the United States, there was no city where Kennedy had

more powerful and active enemies. Not only the local police force, but also the regional bureaus of the FBI and the Secret Service were headed by persons hostile to him. In Dallas there was, to use the favorite *LBJ* term again, a 'consensus' that Kennedy was a president the nation could do without and that Lyndon B. Johnson would make a fine successor. And out of that consensus developed the conspiracy.

But first you had to get the prospective victim into your grip - and Kennedy was reluctant to make the trip to Texas which he himself described to his wife, only a few hours before his death, as 'nut country'. There was only one man who could induce Kennedy to do what he didn't want to do, i.e. to take that trip down to darkest Texas. That man was Lyndon B. Johnson.

Just how loath Kennedy was to go to Texas, and how strong the pressure was which Johnson brought to bear on him has first become known through William Manchester's *The Death of a President*. The published version, at that, is far less outspoken on this ticklish subject than the author's original manuscript. Long before Manchester's censorship problems were highlighted by his spectacular rift with the Kennedy family, his manuscript had been thoroughly revamped by the editors of Harper & Row and of *Look* magazine, especially in this respect. Many passages that were deemed to be offensive to President Johnson had already been deleted and indeed the whole first chapter, and the introduction, had been purged. But even what is left after this blue-pencil rampage goes a long way to expose Johnson as the driving force behind the fateful journey.

The pretext that was used to lure his chief into the prepared death trap was a political one. It was alleged that the inter-party feud between Governor Connally and the conservative wing of the Democratic Party on one hand, and Senator Ralph Yarborough and the liberal faction on the other hand, had reached such proportions that a party split threatened that might have resulted in the loss of Texas to the Republicans at the 1964 elections.

'So Kennedy was obliged to step in and patch things up,' Manchester writes. 'He had to make a real production of the

trip, with Connally, Yarborough, Johnson and himself appearing together in public and in apparent harmony. *The prospect was unappetising and vexing to Kennedy*. It appeared to him that Johnson ought to be able to resolve this petty dispute himself; *the trip seemed to be an imposition*.'

In the published version of the book, Manchester then goes on to 'explain' in a very unconvincing manner why Johnson supposedly wasn't able to settle the political dispute in his own home state so that it was necessary to impose on the President to the point of forcing on him an 'unappetising and vexing' journey:

'Actually, Johnson's problems were authentic. Politically, he had become a cipher. . . ' So far, so good. But then Manchester goes on to illustrate his point by saying that 'Mrs. Johnson had never seen the inside of the famous Presidential plane,' and that 'if Johnson wanted to use a plane he had to apply to the President's Air Force Aide, and sometimes, mortifying to a man of his extreme sensitivity - the request was denied. . . '

What has all that got to do with Texas and the Connally-Yarborough dispute? Johnson may have been a cipher in Washington, but his power and prestige in his home state of Texas was intact. To suggest otherwise, is to mislead the public about the real background of that fatal trip to Dallas.

This is apparently one of the passages in the Manchester book where the editorial pencil had been fast at work. *Newsweek*, in a preview of the contents of the book, on September 5, 1966, reported: 'A third fascinating historical sidelight concerns the last Washington talk between JFK and his Vice President. It was, according to the book, an argument. The President didn't want to make the trip (whose purpose was to patch a Democratic feud in LBJ's home state) and complained that the Vice President's political clout should be sufficient to settle the rift. Mr. Johnson is said to have replied that his influence had waned since taking over the Vice Presidency and that the trip was *vital*.' This tell-tale urgency which Johnson put into his plea for the trip does not appear in the published book.

The *New York Times*, on August 29, 1966, similarly

reported:

'... According to one who has read it, the Manchester manuscript reveals that in their last conversation President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson got into an argument. *President Kennedy did not feel that his visit to Texas was necessary.* Why couldn't Vice-President Johnson, with all his reputed skill as a Texas politician, patch up the feud between the state's two Democratic factions, the Connally Democrats and the Yarborough Democrats, and let the President tend to *pressing business* in Washington? Reflecting that the Texas trip ended in the President's assassination in Dallas, a careless reading of the Kennedy-Johnson argument *might result in anger over the Johnson role.*

'But Mr. Manchester is said to have given at considerable length Mr. Johnson's reasons for using the trip. Texas had been won in 1962 by a perilously slim margin and now the deepening Democratic split threatened loss of the state to the Republicans in 1964. Mr. Johnson is said to have argued that, since becoming Vice President, he had lost much of his political leverage in Texas, and that *only a visit by the President would help.*...'

Little of all that is in the published version of the book. Above all, there is an unmistakable shift in emphasis. The original manuscript had Johnson driving and urging the President, even shoving the unwanted trip down his throat. If 'only a visit by the President would help' the situation in Texas, in Lyndon Johnson's view, that was a challenge so strong as to be almost tantamount to blackmail. In effect, Johnson was saying to his chief: 'If you don't make that trip to Texas, we'll lose the 1964 election, and the whole country will know why.' To a full-blooded politician like Kennedy, threats of such political calamity must have sounded so ominous, he could not but yield. To put it bluntly, perhaps even crudely, but nevertheless accurately, Johnson in this case pricked and goaded Kennedy towards the prepared death trap the way cattle is driven to the slaughterhouse.

What is more, Johnson was the *only* Democratic leader of consequence to advise, nay to urge, Kennedy to make that trip to Texas. Several others are on record as having stren-

uously opposed this idea. The most prominent of these was no other than Governor Connally who, in an interview with the *Dallas Times Herald*, published on January 9, 1967, unmis- takeably stated that he had been against the project.

'I reminded him (Kennedy) he had not made a political appearance in Texas since the 1960 campaign,' Connally said, 'and that if he spoke at four fund-raising dinners, he would be accused of coming to Texas "just to take back a lot of money".'

If doesn't matter why Connally was opposed to the presi- dential visit to his state. The fact that he tried to prevent Kennedy from coming is enough to expose the hollowness of Johnson's pretext for luring the President into the Dallas ambush. Significantly, the AP dispatch from Dallas reporting the above statement began with these words, 'Gov. John B. Connally has indicated he did not want President Kennedy to take the trip to Dallas in November, 1963...' And the *New York Herald Tribune* (Paris edition) headlined the story, on January 10, 1967: **CONNALLY SAYS HE WARNED KENNEDY NOT TO GO TO TEXAS.**

As a matter of fact, Connally must have indicated these feelings even at the time of the tragedy while he was at the hospital. For, *The Dallas Morning News*, on November 23, 1963, stated that Connally had gone to Washington to per- suade Kennedy to *call off* his planned two-day, five-city tour of Texas. The story said that the Governor's purpose was two-fold - the trip would expand rather than heal the split in the Texas Democratic Party, and '*there was the possibility of some unpleasantness*'. (From the *New York Sunday News*, 24.11.63).

On both counts, Connally was right. Indeed, a front-page story in the *Dallas Morning News* of November 22, 1963, proclaimed 'STORM OF POLITICAL CONTROVERSY SWIRLS AROUND KENNEDY ON VISIT', while another headline was - because Senator Yarborough, in Fort Worth, had refused to ride in the same car as Lyndon Johnson - **YARBOROUGH SNUBS LBJ.** And, according to Manches- ter, the first result of the trip was that the feud between the Connally and the Yarborough factions 'had become the

biggest political story in the nation'.

As for the 'unpleasantness' Connally was expecting, I believe this was a covert reference to the Governor's inside knowledge of the Jack Ruby plot against himself (which is described in detail in the first two chapters of my book *Oswald: The Truth*) which might conceivably also lead to harming the President. At all events, this remark shows that Connally had other, far more serious, reasons for warning Kennedy off than the rather petty ones he cited in his January 1967 interview with the *Dallas Times Herald*.

According to the above-cited AP dispatch from Dallas, January 9, 1967, Connally 'made the remarks in reaction to reported statements in William Manchester's book, *The Death of a President*. Mr Manchester reports in the book that five prominent Democrats strongly urged President Kennedy to keep Dallas off his Texas itinerary because of what they felt was a highly charged atmosphere of antagonism toward him in the city. Mr. Manchester does not mention Governor Connally. . . as one of those who advised the President to omit Dallas. . .'

Who were those other 'five prominent Democrats' that had 'strongly urged President Kennedy to keep Dallas off his Texas itinerary?' The readers of the 'authorized' version of the Manchester book will never know.

In the 'authorised' version, as published in the London *Sunday Times* of January 22, 1967, one reads in the paragraph following that little incident about the selection of the Trade Mart and Connally's fruitless attempt at getting a two-tiered table arrangement:

'The atmosphere in Dallas was becoming highly charged by inflammatory statements. No one dreamed that Kennedy would be killed there, though there were many who feared that he might be embarrassed.'

What Manchester originally had written is apparent from the German-language and French-language versions which have been published, respectively, in *Der Stern* (January 15, 1967) and in *Paris-Match* (same date): in retranslation, the German text reads as follows:

'Throughout that month (November, 1963) Byron Skelton,

the Texan delegate to the National Committee of the Democratic Party, had been plagued by sinister forebodings. For, in the meantime, the atmosphere in Dallas had become so explosive that Skelton was genuinely worried. On November 4, he decided to do something about it. He wrote to Attorney General Robert Kennedy: "To tell the truth, I would be greatly relieved if the President were to omit Dallas from his itinerary". Two days later, he wrote a letter to Johnson's adviser, Walter Jenkins, in which he again expressed his concern and his distrust of Dallas.'

At this point, I have to switch to the French-language version in *Paris-Match* which contains important additional details about the Skelton warning which *Der Stern* chose to omit: 'And, to be sure that he would be able to get his point across, he (Skelton) the following week took an airplane to Washington and talked to John Bailey and Jerry Bruno at the National Committee. All these efforts by Skelton proved absolutely fruitless. On November 8, the Attorney-General, who knew him and took him seriously, forwarded Skelton's letter to O'Donnell who judged it to be an unfounded intuition.'

At this juncture, the *Stern* and *Paris-Match* versions again rejoin the *Sunday Times* story, except for one more highly significant episode which, in the German and French texts follows after the Arthur Schlesinger incident and which again is missing in the 'authorised' version as published in the *Sunday Times*. Again, therefore, I retranslate what must have been in the original manuscript of the Manchester book but what subsequently was eliminated by over-zealous censors:

'The most clear-cut warning, which had been addressed to the President himself, was sounded by the liberal Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas. Fulbright mistrusted Dallas because of its past record of political violence. He was afraid - physically afraid - and readily acknowledged it. On October 3 on the eve of the last meeting between Kennedy and Connally at which arrangements for the trip were discussed, Fulbright entreated the President not to go to Dallas. He said to Kennedy: "Dallas is a very dangerous spot. I wouldn't want to go there myself. Don't you go there either".'

One more thing must be added here. Let me quote now from a UPI dispatch, datelined Dallas, January 10, 1967:

'Sen. Ralph Yarborough, D., Texas, a main character in William Manchester's book *The Death of a President*, said yesterday he plans to write his own book on the Kennedy assassination but will wait until 1973 to publish it. Sen. Yarborough told the *Dallas Times Herald* he will wait until 1973 because "there will be two presidential elections behind us then". . .'

I have no doubt that the Yarborough book will be sensational provided the Senator lives to write it.

Chapter 11

What Garrison Has Up His Sleeve

There is one conspicuous flaw in the recurrent controversy about the Kennedy assassination: Too many critics of the official version have allowed themselves to become enmeshed in endless and futile argument about technicalities and trivialities. They have burrowed so deep into the archives, as to finally become bogged down. Or else they've reached the point of no longer being able to see the wood for the trees.

It is difficult to quarrel with authentic experts about ballistic, anatomical, photographic, geometrical and similar details, especially if they happen to be government employees. For any government has the power to withhold and manipulate evidence at will, if not for personal, then for reasons of state.

Actually, the whole line of argument involving such questions as to whether the fatal shot hit Kennedy from the front or the rear; Oswald's marksmanship and the capabilities of his rifle; and whether or not he could have reached a given place at a given time, ceases to be relevant as soon as someone comes forward and says:

'The "good" shots came from the grassy knoll. I know, because I was there. There were five of us lying in wait in that area: two behind the picket fence and three behind the stone-wall. A and B did the shooting, the rest of us stood guard and picked up the shells.'

I didn't just dream up this testimony. There is solid evidence that such a person exists and that he has made a statement to that effect. What is more, I know his name and I'm going to disclose it, even if it does upset Garrison.

To begin with, it is evident from a careful scrutiny of the records, including several statements made by Garrison himself or by members of his staff, that the District Attorney has a big surprise up his sleeve which he is going to spring at the Clay Shaw trial.

I have already quoted one remark made by Garrison him-

self rebutting the charge frequently made by his critics that he had no case against Clay Shaw: 'The only way I could convince them of the strength of my case is to throw open our files and let them examine the testimony of *all our witnesses*. . .'

The only witnesses the prosecution produced at the preliminary hearings were Perry R. Russo, a young insurance salesman who claimed that he had been present at a meeting in the apartment of David Ferrie, in mid-September 1963, at which plans for the assassination of President Kennedy were discussed and who identified Clay Shaw as one of those who attended that meeting; and a young Negro, Vernon Bundy, who alleged that he had seen Shaw and Oswald together one day in the summer of 1963 and that the former had slipped a roll of banknotes to the latter on that occasion.

There has been much controversy (a good deal of it deliberately misleading) about the validity of the evidence given by Russo and Bundy.* While I am one of those who firmly believe that both these witnesses told the truth, I wonder whether the impact of their depositions *alone* would have been strong enough to convince the 12-man Grand Jury that indicted Clay Shaw and the three-man panel of judges who bound him over for trial. There must have been supporting evidence, given to the court in chambers, that will not become a matter of public knowledge until such time as the case goes to trial.

As a matter of fact, when reporters, after the public hearings at which Russo and Bundy testified, expressed doubts that their testimony would be enough to convict in a just trial, Assistant District Attorney James Alcock, Garrison's chief aide pointed out to them, on March 17, that the state did not have to show all of its evidence in the preliminary hearing before the three judges.

'We tried to make it clear from the outset,' Mr. Alcock said, 'that the State of Louisiana did not have to put all of its evidence on the stand. All we had to do was to put out enough to show probable cause.'

Asked whether Russo and Bundy were the state's 'best

witnesses', Mr. Alcock pointedly refused to answer.

'I'm not going to comment on that,' he replied. 'because that essentially would be telling you what we have in reserve.'

In the way he phrased this particular 'No Comment', the Assistant DA of course gave a very strong hint that the state had in fact plenty in reserve. This has also been hinted at by Garrison himself in a number of published statements.

What does the District Attorney 'have in reserve'? Evidently something big that made a far deeper impression on the Grand Jury and the three judges than did the public testimony of Russo and Bundy.

It is significant, in this regard, that at one time during the Grand Jury proceedings a miniature replica of the Dealey Plaza assassination site was carried into the hearing room. No explanation was offered to the reporters waiting outside as to why the Grand Jury would have wanted to examine the layout of the murder scene.

The question, 'Who killed Kennedy?' was not an issue at the Clay Shaw trial (as Judge Haggerty, who is to preside at the trial, himself has pointed out), any more than are the questions as to why and how the President was murdered. Shaw is accused merely of conspiracy to kill, which is a crime of itself, regardless of how or when, or in what form, the project came to fruition.

Why, then, did the Grand Jury have to look at a replica of the ambush site while debating the question whether or not Clay Shaw should be indicted?

I believe I know the answer, and the reader will shortly know, too.

But first, it should be noted that District Attorney Garrison, from the very outset of his probe (or rather, the public controversy over it, beginning in mid-February 1967) has evinced a calm assurance and an absolute confidence that he will win that would be inexplicable if he did not have inside information of devastating importance.

As early as February 23, Garrison stated flatly, without any kind of reservations, that he had solved the assassination 'weeks ago' and that he knew the 'key individuals' involved. At that time, Shaw had not yet been arrested and Perry Russo

* For details, see my book *The Garrison Enquiry*

had not yet been heard from.

'Solved the assassination.' Whoever makes that claim says, in effect: 'I know exactly what happened at Dallas on November 22, 1963. I know where the shots came from, who fired them, how many people took part in the affray, who was in on the planning, who was in command and who was behind it all.'

How could Garrison advance such a claim at a time that he had not yet named a defendant and his most publicized witness-to-come had not yet been heard from?

It stands to reason that, in order to be so assertive, Garrison must have been able to draw on an inside source of information with precise knowledge of the plot and its participants. Who is that person?

Theoretically, he could be either one of the planners, or one of the snipers. In the former case, he would be able to expose the grand design of the conspiracy, in the latter, he could pinpoint the origin of the shots and the identity of those who fired them. All indications are that Garrison's secret informant belonged to the latter category.

For, the Districts Attorney, in several of his pronouncements, has exhibited an almost uncanny knowledge of detail, especially about what happened in the grassy knoll area. Thus, in an interview with a local television station in New Orleans, Garrison, on May 21, 1967, said:

'We have learned what happened. We have located photographs in which we have found the men behind the grassy knoll and stonewall before they dropped completely out of sight. *There were five of them. Three behind the stonewall and two behind the grassy knoll.*'

Maybe Garrison could tell from the photographs alone that there were five men on the scene, and even how they were distributed as between the picket fence (grassy knoll) and the stonewall. What those pictures, however, could not reveal to him is the identity of the snipers.

Yet, in answer to a specific question from the interviewer as to who killed Kennedy (for Garrison, on this occasion, once more firmly denied that Oswald was an assassin), the District Attorney replied:

'Oh I can say who did without any question, and we know the group and we know some of the names of the group. . . *They were former employees of the CIA.* We managed to get the names of some of them in a way I can't describe here, but we cannot find out through any government agency where they are located now. . . and we have a stone wall there as far as the identification of the other individuals. . . But I can say the rest of them are Cubans who were training in New Orleans. . .'

Obviously, Garrison cannot have learned 'some of the names of the group' merely by looking at a picture. And it decidedly took more than a photograph can tell to enable Garrison to identify the five men as 'former employees of the CIA.' The same goes for his separation of the group into 'Cubans who were training in New Orleans' and others he has not yet been able to identify for lack of co-operation from the federal authorities.

In the course of the *Playboy* interview Garrison was to amplify this information further. He said that he had evidence that Kennedy was killed by a precision guerilla team of at least seven men. Four of these were on the grassy knoll in two pairs, one behind the picket fence and one behind the stone wall. It was Garrison's opinion that the job of the second man in each pair was to pick up the empty shells as they were ejected. Garrison also specified that at least two other men fired from behind the President, one from the TSBD and another almost certainly from the Dal-Tex Building which faces it across Houston Street.

Another fascinating disclosure which Garrison made in this interview was that a diversion was created just before the Presidential car drove into the ambush by an individual wearing green combat fatigues who screamed, fell to the ground and simulated an epileptic fit. The purpose of this was to draw people away from the vicinity of the grassy knoll and towards the northeast corner of the Plaza.

It is the detailed nature of Garrison's information that makes him so convincing. For instance, the fact that he knows this man was wearing 'green combat fatigues' reveals how extraordinarily well informed he is about everything that oc-

curred on the scene of the assassination.

Here is another item that corroborates this point:

'It was a precision operation and was carried out coolly and with excellent co-ordination; *the assassins even kept in contact by radio*. The President, of course, had no chance. *It was an overkill operation.* . . ' said Garrison.

Garrison gave the interview to *Playboy* in mid-July, and it would seem that at the time his information was still incomplete. On September 21st. he made a radio broadcast in New York in which he said that there were 'considerably more than seven men' involved in the actual shooting. It is therefore highly probable that in the interval between mid-July and the latter of September Garrison was able to fill in a number of the still missing details. In this broadcast he repeated that the snipers were radio equipped and stated that *they took virtually no risk of being caught*.

This last-cited statement by Garrison is staggering in its implications. Normally, killing a President is a risky business (though not nearly as risky as *trying* to kill him and failing). Quite a few people have gone to the gallows or the electric chair as presidential assassins, even in the United States. Yet in this particular case the murderers apparently had reason to be confident of impunity, provided they were successful in ending the Kennedy Administration. And success was practically assured because it was an 'overkill operation', as Garrison described it himself.

There is no need, really, to elaborate further on that particular Garrison statement.

All these details betray an intimate inside knowledge of the operation and make it a virtual certainty that Garrison has got hold of somebody who was in on the job and who has now 'squealed'. Who could that person be?

Well, I venture to say that the surprise witness for the prosecution Garrison has in store is none other than the 'missing' Manuel Garcia Gonzalez.

That name will ring bells in many informed circles. When the first news about the Garrison enquiry leaked out and reporters from all over the world flocked to New Orleans in late February 1967, the name of a Cuban exile Manuel Garcia

Gonzalez cropped up repeatedly in news dispatches. He was supposed to be the top suspect among several presumed participants in the assassination that the New Orleans District Attorney was believed to be hunting for.

The French newspaper *France-Soir*, for instance, published on March 2, 1967, a dispatch from its special correspondent in New Orleans, Philippe Labro, which reported among other things: '... it has been possible to identify several Cubans (implicated in the plot). One of them, however, can't be found anywhere. He is tall, big, stocky with a moustache and a ferocious mien. . . This Cuban is known by various names: Garcia Gonzalez, Manny Cortès, 'El Torro'. My underworld contacts describe him as a 'torpedo'. . . (a professional killer).'

The German illustrated magazine *Quick*, which has a circulation of a million and a half copies, gave Manuel Garcia Gonzalez a big play in a (pseudo-) interview with Garrison, published on April 9, 1967. The magazine also described the Cuban as a big, hulking brute and named him as the missing No. 1 suspect in the Garrison probe whom the New Orleans prosecutor allegedly had vowed to capture at any cost.

The redoubtable Manuel Garcia Gonzalez also figured as Garrison's supposed No. 1 villain and 'most wanted man' (complete with a full-page artist's sketch of what he is supposed to look like) in an otherwise very well-informed article 'The Inquest' which William Turner, a former FBI man, published in the June 1967 issue of *Ramparts* magazine. This author, too, had Garrison hunting all over the place for this Cuban fugitive from justice.

Now the fact of the matter, which can easily be verified, is that Manuel Garcia Gonzalez has been a prisoner in Garrison's hands for more than a year.

This came out at the perjury trial, on August 9, 1967, of Dean A. Andrews, the New Orleans lawyer whose testimony before the Warren Commission concerning a certain 'Clay Bertrand' first set Garrison on Clay Shaw's track, but who had later tried to recant and in the process embroiled himself in self-evident contradictions.*

* For details, see *The Garrison Enquiry* by Joachim Joesten.

In his eagerness to discredit the District Attorney (who, Andrews claimed, was out to get him on account of his refusal to identify Clay Shaw as Clay Bertrand) Andrews testified, among other things, that he had 'made up' the name of Manuel Garcia Gonzalez and that Garrison then had used this figment of his (Andrews') imagination as an alleged plotter in the Kennedy assassination.

Thereupon the District Attorney put on the stand a New Orleans policeman, John P. Tobin, who testified that, on September 19, 1966, he had apprehended a man subsequently identified as Manuel Garcia Gonzalez on a charge of carrying a concealed weapon. The arrest was made, Tobin said, in Vic's Bar, 1107 Decatur Street, New Orleans. Patrolman Warren Armond, who was a partner of Tobin at the time of the arrest, confirmed this deposition in court.

Armond added that the prisoner spoke so little English the desk sergeant had a hard time getting the man's name right. That name, at the time, didn't mean anything to the arresting officers except to confirm what they could tell by the looks of the man: that he was a 'Latin'.

At Garrison's office, however, the name of Manuel Garcia Gonzalez rang a loud bell. Not because of any supposed connection with the Kennedy murder case - the arrest came about at a time when Garrison was still a firm believer in the Warren Report, and about a month before his investigation got under way - but because Manuel Garcia Gonzalez was wanted in connection with a big narcotics case. So, at his arraignment, the man was held in \$ 50,000 bail which he could not raise; he stayed in prison.

Some weeks later, when the investigation into Kennedy's murder was well under way, one of those rare coincidences that sometimes bust open a case of this sort gave Garrison the big break that he needed. He came across a photograph taken just before the assassination which shows several Latin men behind the picket fence along the top of the grassy knoll. One of these bore a remarkable resemblance to Manuel Garcia Gonzales. This explains why, in the early news bulletins put out last February, when the Garrison investigation was still fresh, it was repeatedly said that Garrison had be-

come interested in the assassination when he learnt that a Cuban of his acquaintance had been seen behind a hoarding close to the scene of the killing. The news media were careful not to use the words 'picket fence'.

It can hardly be doubted that Garrison now felt that he was hot on the trail of the actual assassins. If he were to find that one of them was actually in his custody, it would have been an unbelievable break. It is natural then to assume that he investigated Gonzales' background and record with especial reference to the murder of John F. Kennedy.

Gonzalez already had a police record and he was now facing the possibility of a 30 year sentence on a narcotics rap alone. With this previous convictions, and the 'concealed weapon' charge, there was every chance that he would get a life sentence under the Louisiana Multiple Offenders Act.

In these circumstance, one would hardly be surprised to hear that Gonzales decided to co-operate with the law. His detailed knowledge of the conspiracy, and of those involved in it would be of immense value to Garrison. He must have been aware of the use to which his knowledge could be put. It is therefore highly likely that it was from Gonzales' lips that Garrison obtained his first, and so far most important lead. It developed into a wedge with which to break the whole case wide open.

The time sequence also tells the story. For, another witness at the Andrews perjury trial, a New Orleans writer and correspondent for *Life* magazine named David L. Chandler, who was once Garrison's close friend and confidant, revealed in his testimony that the District Attorney, as early as December 1966, had suspected Clay Shaw.

Chandler quoted Garrison as telling him, in December: 'Andrews is lying because of his conflicting statements to the Warren Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Why is Andrews lying? Obviously to protect a client. Who are his clients? Homosexuals. Therefore, he's lying to protect a prominent homosexual. Who would that be? Clay Bertrand - Clay Shaw. Furthermore, Shaw has a house in Hammond.'

Chandler then went on to explain to the court that Garrison

found the Hammond angle significant in that he believed Oswald had been trained at a guerrilla camp in that city. Chandler added that Garrison had also pointed out to him that Shaw speaks Spanish.

This testimony affords a glimpse of some still hidden key elements of the Garrison enquiry which one cannot explore further as long as the Clay Shaw case is *sub judice*. There is, however, nothing to prevent me from emphasizing the fact, brought out in a courtroom under oath, that the District Attorney was investigating Shaw as far back as December 1966. This disposes of the much-heard version, carefully nurtured in some sections of the press, that Garrison's case against Shaw has no other foundation than the testimony of Perry R. Russo - who did not appear on the scene until February 24, 1967.

Now Garrison himself has said in several published statements that it was not until (an unspecified date in) October 1966 that he made up his mind to investigate the Kennedy assassination primarily because of the fact that Oswald had been living in New Orleans from April 25 to September 22, 1963.

Next, Garrison again by his own testimony, went into the backbreaking job of plowing methodically through the 26 volumes of Warren Commission hearings and exhibits to search for other New Orleans angles in the case. It must have taken him at best a few weeks to accomplish that task, even with the aid of a few assistants.

Under the circumstances, it cannot have been much earlier than, say, the middle of November 1966 that the investigation proper was set in motion. And a few weeks later, in December (again, no exact date was given by Chandler) Garrison is already expanding on Clay Shaw's alleged connection with the assassination! Clearly, then, there must have been, about late November or early December, a sudden break in the case - a break of such magnitude that Garrison was able to unravel, in a matter of a few scant weeks, the whole extraordinarily complex skein of the Kennedy murder plot.

What kind of windfall can that have been? Obviously, the confession of somebody who was privy to the inner secrets

of the conspiracy. An informer who was able to reveal to the District Attorney, among other things, that the assassination was carried out by a precision guerilla team consisting in part of members of the American paramilitary right and in part of anti-Castro-Cubans; that they, all of them, were employees of the Central Intelligence Agency; and that the various groups of snipers attacking the presidential motorcade simultaneously from the front and the rear kept in touch with each other by radio.

That informer was, in all probability, Manuel Garcia Gonzalez. In the *Playboy* interview Garrison refers to two Cuban exiles who were part of the 'operative' level of the conspiracy, one of whom was given a lie-detector test and was asked whether he had known in advance that Kennedy would be killed and whether he had seen the weapons to be used in the assassination. It appears that he failed the test.

In order to apply a lie-detector test to anybody, Garrison obviously must have had that person in custody, or at least available. And if this particular Cuban exile was being tested for his advance knowledge of the assassination and whether or not he had *seen* the weapons to be used in the crime, it stands to reason that he must have belonged to the guerilla team directly involved in the operation.

This remark by Garrison strongly corroborates my conclusion that he has Manuel Garcia Gonzalez in his custody and that this man is going to be the District Attorney's surprise witness at the Clay Shaw trial.

It is also significant, in this respect, that Perry Russo testified, at the preliminary Shaw hearing, that two Cubans in battle fatigue dress who were introduced to him as 'Manuel' and 'Julian' attended that conspiratorial meeting at the apartment of David Ferrie in mid-September 1963 where he also placed Clay Shaw and the man who called himself Leon Oswald.*

Likewise, Mrs. Sylvia Odio, in her testimony before the

* Perry Russo's testimony brought out clearly enough that 'Leon Oswald' was *not* Lee Harvey Oswald but an impostor who impersonated the latter (for details, see *The Garrison Enquiry* Chapter 5).

Warren Commission, on July 22, 1964,** had reported a visit to her home by two Cubans and a man who called himself Leon Oswald, toward the end of September 1963, and that one of these Cubans the next day had said to her on the phone that in 'Oswald's' view 'President Kennedy should have been assassinated after the Bay of Pigs.'

One more observation concerning Manuel Garcia Gonzalez is in order.

In all of the newspaper and magazine stories in which he has been featured as a prime suspect of the Garrison enquiry Manuel Garcia Gonzalez is described as a 'powerfully built' man with a ferocious mien.

But Patrolman Tobin, when asked by Andrews, at the latter's perjury trial, what the Gonzalez he had arrested looked like, replied that he was a man about five feet seven inches tall, who weighed 150 pounds, with black hair and an olive complexion. His partner Armond confirmed this description which can hardly be said to be that of a husky brute.

There may be a simple explanation of this discrepancy, though. That the powerfully built Cuban 'torpedo' who has inspired such awe in some reporters was not Manuel Garcia Gonzalez at all but his companion, 'Julian', whose last name has been given in some press reports as Buznedo.

Julian Buznedo, moreover, has been identified as a survivor of the Bay of Pigs disaster - and Garrison has stated repeatedly that one such survivor was among the killers who ambushed President Kennedy in Dallas.

At all events, the facts about Manuel Garcia Gonzalez that have come to light as a result of the Dean Andrews perjury trial dispel the myth that he is the one Garrison's men are hunting high and low as a suspected Kennedy killer. Rather he seems to have been one of those on the grassy knoll whose assignment it was to pick up the cartridges ejected from the killers' rifles. And that comparatively minor role made it possible for Manuel to become Garrison's most vocal songbird - and his surprise star witness at the forthcoming trial.

** Cf. *Oswald: The Truth*, pp. 96-97

Chapter 12

Was Tippit the Man in the Window?

There is a real possibility that Patrolman J. D. Tippit, rather than Oswald, was the man who fired at the presidential motorcade from the sixth floor window of the Texas School Book Depository.

As a matter of fact, this assumption is supported by a chain of circumstantial evidence far stronger than the one forged by the Dallas Police, the FBI, and the Warren Commission to convict Lee H. Oswald.

Let us consider this evidence, point by point.

1. - In the first place, there is the remarkable fact, never fully appreciated by the public at large, that Tippit, too, bore a marked facial resemblance to Oswald.

As there is only one picture of Tippit available, this similarity may not be apparent at first glance. It becomes quite striking, though, when one selects from the great mass of Oswald photos one that shows his head in approximately the same position as the lone Tippit picture.

Even a casual comparison of the two portraits will show a marked similarity in the contours of the brow and the hairline; the shape of the nose, ears and chin; and, above all, in the form and expression of the eyes.

The most conspicuous difference is that Tippit's face appears fuller and heavier, suggesting that he was a man of rather stocky build (no full-length picture of him is available for the reasons detailed below). The features are also those of a distinctly older man (Tippit was 34, Oswald 24).

2. - The fact that the Dallas police, while doing everything in their power to build up the slain policeman as a national hero, did not promptly make available to the press any pictures of Tippit, and that his widow also kept the family album under lock and key, indicates that both were aware of this resemblance, and afraid of the conclusions that might have been drawn from it.

Indeed, there is nothing in the annals of the contemporary press to match this unique pictorial anonymity of a world celebrity. The completely phony (see *Oswald: The Truth*) story of how the brave cop J. D. Tippit stopped President Kennedy's dastardly assassin and was then shot down in his turn by the rampant desperado made the rounds of the world press not just once but at least two or three times. His name became a household word from New York to Timbuktu. And no picture of the great man!

What is even odder than this most unusual reluctance to exhibit the features of a national hero and world celebrity is that the press, which was thus deprived of one of its standard tools of the trade, not only did not protest against this embargo, both official and private, on all pictures of Tippit, it did not even remark on it. It was simply taken for granted, like all the other absurdities of the Oswald story.

The first, and only, Tippit picture was released in connection with the Warren Report, apparently on the assumption that the whole matter was now settled so irrevocably that no further precautions were needed. The Warren Commission turned the assassination of President Kennedy into the perfect crime and all instigators, perpetrators, accomplices and accessories after the fact thereafter felt jubilantly secure.

3. - The description of the man in the window given by the principal eye-witness who saw him in action, Howard L. Brennan, does not fit Oswald, but it does fit Tippit!

Indeed, H. L. Brennan, whom the Commission considered its star witness, described the sniper as a much older and heavier man than Oswald. The Warren Report says on this score:

'In his sworn statement to the police later that day (November 22, 1963) Brennan described the man in similar terms, except that he gave the weight as between 165 and 175 pounds and the height was omitted. . .'

The reference to 'in similar terms' relates to the preceding sentence which stated that the radio alert sent to police cars at approximately 12:45 p.m. described the suspect as white, slender, weighing about 165 pounds, about 5'10" tall, and in his early thirties. The Warren Commission believes that

this description 'most probably' was based on the information Brennan immediately gave to a policeman about the man he had seen firing from the window.

The Warren Report then goes on to say:

'In his testimony before the Commission, Brennan described the person he saw as ". . . [dots in the text - it would be interesting to know what was omitted - J. J.] a man in his early thirties, fair complexion, slender, but neat, neat slender, possibly 5 foot 10. . . (dots again in the text - see above, J. J.) 160 to 170 pounds".'

There follows, in the Report, this sentence which must be read slowly, indeed, to be fully appreciated:

'Oswald was 5'9", slender and 24 years old [as he was born on October 18, 1939, he had just turned 24 - J. J.] When arrested, he gave his weight as 140 pounds. On other occasions, he gave weights of both 140 and 150 pounds. The New Orleans police records of his arrest in August of 1963 show a weight of 136 pounds. The autopsy report indicated an estimated weight of 150 pounds. . .'

The last sentence is truly arresting. It affords further proof (but does one really need any more?) that the Dallas authorities unvaryingly doctored the facts, in the Oswald case, to suit their false story. Imagine: an important person has just been murdered (for, in a legal sense, the assassin of a President is just about as important as the President himself) and an autopsy is made. Do they place the naked body on a scale to determine his weight? Oh, no, not in Dallas. They estimate his weight, and come up with a guess that would make Oswald, in November, 14 pounds heavier than he had been in August! The procedure is typical of the whole Oswald case.

Although the Commission treated this matter lightly, for it neither pursued the subject any further, nor did it comment on the official assertion that Oswald (who, at the time of his arrest was thin and wiry, as his pictures prove) had put on 14 pounds in the previous three months, it actually warrants careful consideration.

For, if his police record of August 1963 shows that Oswald weighed 136 pounds at that time, then the weight he himself

indicated after his arrest on November 22, 1963, to wit 140 pounds, was right, or nearly so, and the autopsy estimate was at least 10 pounds out.

The point is of great importance, for Brennan, as we have seen, gave the weight of the assassin as between 165 and 175 pounds, and in his testimony before the Commission, as 160 to 170 pounds. (Here, again, one notes the official tendency to make the disparity in weight appear smaller by reducing the figure originally given by Brennan and increasing Oswald's weight in the autopsy estimate). Even at the lowest estimate - 160 - the difference would be appreciable; at the highest - 175 — it would be considerable.

It is perfectly clear, then, that the man Brennan had seen at the window was much heavier than Oswald was; this is also indicated by the description 'slender neat', which the witness used.

I do not know how much Tippit weighed, because the Dallas police has been extremely sparing in the information it gave out about the hero (the bulk of the publicity was directed, for obvious reasons, to the bereaved widow and her small children), but his full, and rather coarse features suggest that he must have been a man of at least 165 to 175 pounds.

Next, let us examine the question of age. Oswald was barely 24 and he actually looked younger than his age. It would be quite impossible to describe him as a man 'in his early thirties'. *But this description exactly fits Tippit.*

Nor was Oswald as tall as the person described by Brennan and in the police broadcast; he was one inch shorter.

Again, I do not know how tall Tippit was, but policemen, as a rule, are at least medium-sized, so it is not unreasonable to assume that Tippit was at least 5 foot 10.

In any event, it is indisputable that, all other points being equal (white, fair complexion, slender) Tippit, on the basis of age and weight, would have answered the description of the man in the window to a far greater degree than Oswald.

The Warren Report, through one of those reportorial sleights-of-hand unworthy of a Commission of notables, seeks to create the impression that Brennan positively identified Oswald as the man he saw in the window. The opposite is

true, as the Report itself explicitly states:

'During the evening of November 22, Brennan identified Oswald as the person in the line-up who bore the closest resemblance to the man in the window but he said he was unable to make a positive identification.'

This statement is embedded in the Warren Report. It cannot be spirited or explained away. No amount of prestidigitation or sophistry will do. It will stand. Brennan, at the police line-up held within hours after the assassination, did *not* make a positive identification of Oswald as the man he had seen in the window. All he did was to say that, of the four men in the police line-up, Oswald was the one who resembled the sniper most. And now I invite the reader to judge for himself what that means; for, in another context, the Warren Report tells us who the other three men in that line-up were:

Two of them, John T. Horn and David Knapp, were both 18 years old. As Brennan had seen 'a man in the early thirties', that ruled out these two teenagers *a priori*. The third man, Daniel Lujan, aged 26, was a Mexican and therefore did not answer Brennan's description of a man of 'fair complexion'. That left only Oswald with even the vaguest possible resemblance to the man in the window.

Although the Warren Commission is satisfied that the line-ups were conducted fairly, this example alone shows the opposite to be true. How could a line-up possibly be loaded more unfairly against a given person than was done in this case? If three out of four persons are selected by age or complexion in such a manner that any resemblance to the person to be identified is excluded, is not the fourth automatically imposed upon the viewer?

What really happened, then, at that police line-up, is that Brennan merely recognized the obvious: since teenagers do not look like men in their early thirties, and Mexicans are not, as a rule, fair-complexioned, Oswald had to be the one with 'the most resemblance'. But it does not prove in the least that Oswald was identical with the man in the window; if Tippit were that man, there would have been enough resemblance to make deliberate confusion possible.

4. - *Tippit was closely connected with the John Birch*

Society. - This startling, and extraordinarily revealing fact was brought to light, for the first time, by the Warren Commission which states in its Report:

'Although at the time of the assassination Tippit was working week-ends in a restaurant owned by a member of the John Birch Society, the restaurant owner stated that he never discussed politics with Tippit. . .'

In accepting at face value such an assurance, the Commission again evinces boundless naïvety at best. The John Birch Society is not only the richest and most powerful branch of the extreme right, but a rabidly subversive organization, as activities of its leading Dallas member, General Edwin A. Walker (once charged with sedition in the Oxford, Miss., riots of 1962), among others, demonstrate. It played a leading part in instigating violence against Adlai Stevenson and assiduously prepared a welcome for President Kennedy what was anything but friendly.

Furthermore, the John Birch Society had recently been making a determined effort to infiltrate and subvert police officials in key cities. This was brought to light, dramatically, when Mayor James H. J. Tate of Philadelphia announced, on November 15, 1964, that he had taken disciplinary action against 14 or 15 members of the Philadelphia police force, including two lieutenants, two detectives and two sergeants, who had been found to be members of the John Birch Society.

According to *The New York Times* (16-11-64) Mayor Tate said investigation had disclosed 'that some Birch Society groups had been established in policemen's homes and that members were trying to recruit others "to follow this philosophy."

'This,' he said, 'is the way the Nazi party began and this is the way the Communist party operated in the forties.'

In the light of these disclosures, it is impossible to put an innocent face on the fact that Tippit while a full-time police officer was in the employ of a Dallas Bircher, as the Commission attempts to do. Rather, this situation proves that Tippit himself was either a member, or a tool of that subversive organization which hated Kennedy more than

any of his predecessors, all of whom the Birchers regarded as 'Communists' or 'Communist dupes'.

5. - *Tippit conspired with other Birchers at Ruby's night club.* The startling revelation made in the Warren Report, that Tippit was in the employ of a Dallas Bircher adds further weight to the sensational disclosure previously made by the lawyer Mark Lane of a secret meeting held a week before the assassination at Ruby's Carousel Club, at which Tippit, Bernard Weissman (the author of the despicable 'Welcome, Mr. Kennedy' ad in the *Dallas Morning News*, identified in the Warren Report as an active member of the John Birch Society) and an unnamed third man attended.

When Chief Justice Warren and other members of the Commission on June 7, 1964, interviewed Ruby at the Dallas County jail, General Counsel Rankin told Ruby:

'There was a story that you were sitting in your Carousel Club with Mr. (Bernard) Weissman, Officer Tippit, and another man who has been called a rich oil man, at one time shortly before the assassination. Can you tell us anything about that?'

To which Ruby replied with a counter-question: 'Who was the rich oil man?'

After that, unbelievably, the subject was dropped. Apparently, Messrs. Warren and Rankin felt they were getting too warm. Ruby's reaction indicated that he was ready to talk since he had nothing to lose. But the Commission members weren't looking for the truth. They shied away from it, as from the plague. And so the topic was quickly shifted. Ruby never got a second chance to answer 'yes' or 'no' to the vitally important question of whether such a meeting was held. Yet his surprise reaction, which so put off Messrs. Warren and Rankin that they quickly changed the subject, indicates that the story of that meeting is true.

6. - *Tippit was an old pal of Ruby.* The Warren Commission made a feeble attempt to gloss over this embarrassing fact first exposed by *The New York Herald Tribune* on December 5, 1963, in an article that said in part: 'Jack Ruby, the strip-joint proprietor who murdered Lee Harvey Oswald... knew the dead Patrolman, J. D. Tippit, well.'

“ Jack called him buddy,” Mrs. Eva Grant, Ruby’s sister, told the Herald Tribune in a telephone interview. “Jack knew him, and I knew him. He used to come into both the Vegas Club and the Carousel Club. . . He was in and out of our place many times.”

Now let us see how the Warren Report handled this rather hot potato: ‘Some confusion has arisen, however, because early Friday afternoon, November 22, Ruby remarked that he knew the Tippit who had been shot by Oswald. Later Ruby stated that he did not know J. D. Tippit but that his reference was to G. M. Tippit, a member of the special services bureau of the Dallas Police Department who had visited Ruby’s establishments occasionally in the course of his official duties. . .

This is such stupendous humbug that one almost feels sorry for the Warren Commission for having allowed such a slip to mar its ‘historic document’.

For G. M. Tippit is still very much alive, or at least he was when Ruby changed his story, presumably under police pressure. How on earth could Ruby, having remarked that he knew the Tippit who had been *shot* by Oswald, say he hadn’t meant to refer to the dead J. D. Tippit, but had the living G. M. Tippit in mind? And how on earth could the Warren Commission, composed of seven dignitaries, surrounded by 20-odd lawyers, accept such glaring nonsense and put it in the record?

But then they probably had to go to such extremes of silliness because the alternative - admitting that Tippit was an old pal of the gangster Ruby - would have been just a bit too embarrassing, especially if this is viewed in conjunction with the other incriminating items.

Add it all up: Tippit, the Bircher, holding a two-hour secret meeting with other right-wing subversives just before the assassination at the business place of his old crony, Jack Ruby. That is a long cry, indeed, from Tippit, the shining hero who gave his life in the line of duty! No wonder the Warren Commission preferred not to press its investigation into Tippit’s background, connections and activities.

7. - The very fact that Tippit himself was murdered, within 45 minutes of the assassination, by a gunman who simply

cannot have been Oswald suggests that he may have been the sniper in the window. There are many precedents in history for conspirators being disposed of by their fellow-plotters, after the successful perpetration of a capital crime, in order to have their lips sealed forever. This has not only happened, throughout history, on the high level of regicides and presidential assassinations, or the killing of Premiers and Ministers, but it also happens all the time among gangsters. And the Dallas story has many affinities with gangland methods.

8. - Why was Tippit driving in his squad car straight towards Ruby’s apartment when he ran into ‘Oswald’ and was killed after a short exchange of words? Isn’t the answer obvious?

9. - The extraordinary ballyhoo about Tippit and his widow whipped up by the Dallas Police Department that produced a collection of more than \$ 600,000 for the latter, bespeaks a sense of guilt. Apparently, the high police officials who first connived at the conspiracy against President Kennedy and then winked at the sacrifice of one of their own men who had been used as a tool, felt they had to make up for it somehow to the bereaved widow. Besides, the money that was showered upon Mrs. Tippit didn’t come out of *their* pockets. It came out of the pockets of the most gullible public on earth.

10. - The least the Warren Commission could and should have done was to have weighed all those indications listed above with a critical eye and to have probed deeper into the possible implications of each and all of them.

They did not do so, because they never could bring themselves even to consider the possibility of police complicity in the assassination. Now, if this tragedy had happened in a country, like say, Switzerland or Denmark, where police criminality is virtually non-existent (except perhaps for petty offences), there might have been some justification for this attitude.

In the United States, however, it is a matter of common knowledge that the police, especially on the local level and in the big cities, is shot through with underworld connections, and countless police officials have been convicted of serious

crimes. Far more of them would be in prison if there wasn't so much 'esprit de corps' among the guardians of the law.

Look what happened in Mississippi where on December 4, 1964, the Sheriff of Neshoba County and his deputy were arrested by the FBI (and one of them subsequently convicted - even in Mississippi!) on charges of having actually led the gang of vicious murderers who killed the three civil rights workers Schwerner, Goodman and Cheney on June 22, 1964.

In the South, police complicity with every sort of crime committed by the segregationist fanatics is not the exception but the rule. Texas, too, belongs to the South, at least in part; and its other half is part of the Wild West. On both counts, there is good reason to distrust its police, especially in the case of men like Chief Curry and Capt. Fritz who have already been caught in countless lies and forgeries. And Tippit was under their orders.

As in virtually every important respect, Garrison has strikingly confirmed what I wrote about Tippit in *Oswald: The Truth* (Chapter 20, 'The Tippit Murder Hoax').

In the *Playboy* interview Garrison made it clear that he was convinced that Oswald did not shoot Tippit. His evidence, he said, led him to believe that two men were responsible for this killing, and he even claimed that he had identified one of them. He also emphasised the points made by almost every critic of the Report concerning the discrepancy between Oswald's description and that given by the witnesses to Tippit's death of his killer; and, again in agreement with the critics, he stressed that the time factor alone made it impossible for Oswald to have been on the scene of the crime.

I myself had made these points in *Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?* as early as 1964. But there are other discrepancies in the evidence which have not escaped Garrison's attention. For instance, four cartridges were found at the scene of the killing. As revolvers do not eject cartridges, one cannot expect to find them scattered about unless the murderer deliberately goes out of his way to eject them.

Garrison believes that the conspirators had previously obtained cartridges from Oswald's revolver and planted them near to where Tippit was killed as part of the plan to frame

him. It is, however, a strange fact that of the four bullets taken from Tippit's body three were Winchesters and one was a Remington. On the other hand, of the cartridges picked up, two were Remingtons and two were Winchesters. And this point is not lost on Garrison either.

It can hardly be doubted now that Tippit's death not only eliminated a potentially dangerous accomplice, but was also deliberately conceived as another link in the chain of false evidence designed to incriminate Oswald. It will go down in history as possibly the most elaborate and vicious frame-up ever devised.

One of Garrison's earliest statements, made soon after his investigation hit the world headlines, but reported in not one single British newspaper, was 'I have no reason to believe that Oswald killed anybody that day in Dallas.' In the *Playboy* interview he reaffirmed that statement and added that he hoped to produce in a court of law the two men who did kill Tippit. The interview suggested that his investigations into this aspect were still under way. That this was so was confirmed by his statement in the broadcast he made in New York over two months later at the end of September, when he declared that his investigators had now returned from Dallas and that he was convinced of police complicity in the assassination.

If Oswald didn't kill Tippit - a fact clearly demonstrated by tangible as well as circumstantial evidence, and repeatedly stressed by Garrison, who obviously knows a lot about the real killers - then why was Tippit murdered?

Conceivably, and in pure theory, the Tippit slaying could be completely unrelated to the Kennedy assassination, but such an assumption does not stand up in the light of what Garrison has said. For Garrison's investigation is concerned solely with the murder of President Kennedy, *and related events*, not with any *unrelated* killings that might have occurred in Dallas which is outside Garrison's jurisdiction. If he has probed so deeply into the Tippit case as to identify one of the killers and is even hopeful of presenting both

gunmen in a court of law - which can be only in New Orleans - the implication is inescapable that the Tippit drama is indeed an integral part of the Kennedy assassination.

And if Tippit was not involved as a secondary victim, then elementary logic leads one to conclude that he must have been involved as a conspirator. That this assumption is by no means far-fetched but is, on the contrary, supported by a large number of concordant indications, has already been substantiated above. And Garrison himself has now made it abundantly clear that such indeed was the case. In the statement already referred to (see page 74) which he issued with the subpoenas for the witnesses Hall, Howard and Beckham, he included this tremendously significant statement: 'The American people have never been told the names of 10 men (some of whom we have identified as participants in the assassination) who were arrested in Dealey Plaza minutes after the assassination. They later were quietly released after the murder of Officer Tippit, in another part of Dallas, provided the necessary diversion to cover their release.'

It may not perhaps be obvious at first glance just why the shooting of a policeman would cover the release of a gang of hired assassins caught almost red-handed, but if we remember that it was Tippit's death that led almost immediately to the arrest of Oswald, the predestined scapegoat, then Garrison's meaning becomes clear.

Tippit's death, in fact, served four purposes. It eliminated one of the assassins, one moreover, who might have been recognised by someone who had seen him at 'Oswald's' window, and it provided the pretext for the arrest of Oswald. By thus giving the public the impression that Oswald had shot a policeman while resisting arrest, it became far easier for the conspirators to convince the world that he had actually been the President's assassin. And it distracted attention from the other arrests, at least two of which, as I showed in my book *Oswald: Assassin or Fall-Guy?*, were reported in the press at the time.

There remains one point to be made concerning Tippit. I have repeatedly stressed in the foregoing that I do not doubt that the conspiratorial meeting at the Carousel, on

November 14, 1963 took place as described by Mark Lane in his book *Rush to Judgment*. According to Lane, the two-hour meeting was attended by Bernard Weissman, Officer Tippit and the operator of the Carousel, Jack Ruby. The 'oil man' who was allegedly also present was a 'creature of the Commission', Lane says. His informant had not mentioned such a person and, indeed, the transcript of the Lane testimony shows that there was no mention of him. This mythical 'oil man' thus appears to have been a figment of the Commission's own imagination and a red herring which Ruby quickly grasped in order to divert attention from the real participants in the meeting - Ruby, Weissman and Tippit.

On the other hand, however, I hold, and have amply documented this view in *Oswald: The Truth*, that Ruby was *not* one of those who intended to kill President Kennedy but that he had a little plot of his own, aimed solely at doing away with Governor Connally. Is this not a contradiction?

Not necessarily. One possible explanation is that the two Birchers, Weissman and Tippit, attempted at this meeting - at which the eventual Presidential motorcade route, which had just been determined by selection of the Trade Mart, was certainly a topic - to draw Ruby deeper into their own plot than he himself wished to get. Or else, Weissman and Tippit pretended to go along with Ruby's scheme for shooting the governor, without harming the President, and then double-crossed their accomplice. Or there may be another explanation.

Many of the details of what happened at Dallas on November 22, 1963, and before, still remain obscure and some of them undoubtedly will remain so forever. But the overall pattern has become clearly discernible.

Tippit, I am satisfied, was up to his neck in the conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. A Bircher, a marksman and a member of the police force which almost openly connived at the ambush in Dealey Plaza, he was most probably one of the actual snipers - and was quickly silenced for that very reason. And the description which Howard Brennan has given of the Man in the Window makes it a near-certainty, in my opinion, that Officer J. D. Tippit impersonated Lee Harvey Oswald at the deadliest part of the frame-up.

The Guilt of the Secret Service

Not only the Dallas Police chiefs, but at least some of the Secret Service men on the scene were also implicated in the assassination of President Kennedy. Although Garrison has not yet given vent to any suspicions in that direction, I unhesitatingly make that charge on the strength of overwhelming evidence which is freely available to anyone looking for it.

The Warren Commission, forever faithful to its 'intrinsic purpose' of obscuring the truth about the Kennedy murder by diverting attention from the essential facts, also drew a fat red herring across this particular trail. In Chapter VIII of their Report, the seven sages deal at great length with the history of presidential protection (or the lack of such); with the organization and procedures of the Secret Service, whose primary duty is to guard the life of the President; with the question of proper liaison between the Secret Service and other government agencies, etc. etc. and they wind up this section with a long list of recommendations for improving security in the future. In doing so, the Commission deliberately focussed attention on generalities and even trivialities, while taking great care not to touch upon, but to sidestep the cardinal issues in the case which are:

- (a) Why didn't the Secret Service thoroughly inspect and guard the buildings along the presidential motorcade route?
- (b) Why didn't the Secret Service men on the spot react immediately and forcefully against the attack on the President?

'The President's trip to Dallas called into play many standard operating procedures of the Secret Service. . . ' the Report states and adds, 'Examination of these procedures shows that in most respects they were well conceived and ably executed by the personnel of the Service. . . '

This is another glaring example of the Commission's un-

canny ability to draw untenable conclusions from its own findings. It would be interesting to know just what part of the Secret Service plan for the protection of President Kennedy in Dallas was 'well conceived' or 'ably executed' - unless this be considered a subconscious reference to the role of the Secret Service in assuring the success of the plot to kill the Chief of State.

'The Commission concludes that the most significant advance arrangements for the President's trip were soundly planned', the Report goes on to say. 'In particular, the Commission believes that the motorcade route selected by Agent Lawson, upon the advice of Agent in Charge Sorrels and with the concurrence of the Dallas Police, was entirely appropriate. . . '

I have already dealt with the subject of the motorcade route in a preceding chapter and have shown, I believe, that it was 'appropriate' for only one purpose, namely to lead Kennedy into a trap where he could be killed with a minimum of risk and a maximum chance of success.

In this connection, the following passage from the Commission Report is not without significance, for it indirectly concedes that security was not the overriding element in selecting the parade route, as it should have been: '*There were far safer routes via freeways directly to the Trade Mart, but these routes would not have been in accordance with the White House staff instructions given the Secret Service for a desirable motorcade route.*'

In making that dubious statement, the Commission didn't elaborate on who gave instructions for a motorcade route to be picked that would be 'more desirable' than a safe one, nor why any unsafe route should be desirable at all. It didn't do so because it couldn't without getting into really deep water.

The next statement in the Warren Report is even more untenable:

'Much of Lawson's time was taken with establishing adequate security over the motorcade route and at the two places where the President would stop, Love Field and the Trade Mart. The Commission concludes that the arrangements worked out at the Trade Mart by these Secret Service agents

with the co-operation of the Dallas Police and other local law enforcement agents, were carefully executed. . .'

It takes a lot of nerve, indeed, for the Commission to suggest that 'adequate security' had been established by the Secret Service over the motorcade route from Love Field airport to the Trade Mart, when the precise opposite is not only self-evident but is even explicitly recognized by the Commission a few paragraphs further down in its Report:

'Agent Lawson did not arrange for a prior inspection of buildings along the motorcade route, either by police or by custodians of the buildings, since it was not the usual practice of the Secret Service to do so. . .'

The Report then goes on to cite a long 'explanation of this policy' with which the Chief of the Secret Service provided the Commission, claiming, among other things, that it was 'not practical' to guard even tall buildings along a ten-mile route, and rejects it in these terms: 'This justification of the Secret Service's standing policy is not persuasive. . . Admittedly, protective measures cannot ordinarily be taken with regard to all buildings along a motorcade route. Levels of risk can be determined, however, as has been confirmed by buildings surveys made since the assassination for the Department of the Treasury. *An attempt to cover only the most obvious points of possible ambush along the route in Dallas might well have included the Texas School Book Depository Building. . .*'

There is an evident and irreconcilable contradiction between this guarded statement of fact and the Commission's hypocritical assertion, cited above, that 'adequate security' had been established along the motorcade route.

What is more, one of the most eminent authorities on the subject, former Secret Service chief U.E. Baughman, who headed that agency from 1948 to 1961, has publicly taken issue, in several newspaper interviews, with the lack of adequate precautions which is so painfully apparent in the Dallas tragedy.

A UPI dispatch from Washington, dated December 8, 1963, quoted Mr. Baughman as saying that 'there are a lot of things to be explained' concerning the assassination.

One thing Baughman wanted to know - nobody has ex-

plained it yet - is why Lee H. Oswald was permitted to leave the Book Depository after the shooting.

He asked, also, assuming that the shots did come from the sixth-floor window of that building, *why the Secret Service didn't immediately pepper that window with machine gun fire?*

This is one of the most obvious - and least asked - of all 'unanswered questions' about the Kennedy murder. Why, indeed, was all the shooting done only by one side - that of the assassins?

There were dozens of Secret Service men on the scene, all former FBI agents and tested marksmen, quick on the trigger and with their service guns and submachine guns at the ready - to say nothing of the hundreds of Dallas policemen who were also present when the President died in a hail of bullets. *And not a single shot was fired by any of these alert guardians of the law!*

Had the Secret Service men reacted as Baughman says they should have, by instantly 'peppering' the TSBD window with machine gun fire, the sniper crouching behind that window would certainly not have been able to get off a second or third shot, as the Commission says he did.

In a subsequent interview with Seth Kantor of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain*, Mr. Baughman declared that it was a 'basic, established rule' of the Secret Service to see to it that people were kept out of the upper stories of buildings along a presidential parade route. The manager of the Texas School Book Depository therefore 'should have been under firm instructions by the police' to close the upper floors of that building to unauthorized persons.

This unequivocal statement by a Secret Service chief of long standing gives the lie to the above-cited passage in the Warren Report: 'Agent Lawson did not arrange for a prior inspection of buildings. . . , since it was not the usual practice of the Secret Service to do so.'

The Warren Commission, to be sure, carefully avoided

* See for example The New York World Telegram and Sun of December 11, 1963.

hearing Baughman's expert opinion in the case, since it runs counter to its argument that 'adequate' measures had been taken to safeguard the President's security.

As the last building on the western edge of downtown Dallas, the Texas School Book Depository 'certainly had to be considered a key building as a place from which to shoot the President' Mr. Baughman was quoted by Seth Kantor as saying.

He added: 'Truly (the superintendent of the *TSBD*) should have been under strict orders not to allow any person, an employee or not, into the upper floors. . . following customary Secret Service rules.'

The failure of the Secret Service in Dallas to abide by this basic, established rule may be interpreted as a sign of incompetence or negligence. This charitable view prevails among those observers who, like William Manchester, are critical of much that happened in Dallas in those dark days of November, 1963, but who nevertheless accept the official version of Oswald having killed the President, alone and unaided.

The New York Times, in a preview of the then forthcoming *Death of a President*, published on December 20, 1966 (International Edition) put it this way:

'A man who now has the 1,300 page manuscript said today that the book gave names of allegedly negligent Dallas policemen, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Secret Service men, in appraising the assassination in Dallas November 22, 1963. "This book", said the man who asked to remain unidentified, "is full of the ineptitude of those who were supposed to protect the President."'

The 'negligent' Dallas police men - some of them, anyway - have since been revealed to have been accomplices of the conspirators (Cf. Chapter 1). That fact alone renders everything the Secret Service did or did not do on that fateful day doubly suspect, for the two police forces worked in close co-operation in making the arrangements for the motorcade.

Gross negligence in the performance of official duties is of course a crime in itself and when it is committed by the appointed guardians of the President's life, and results in his assassination, such behaviour would normally call for stern

punishment. Yet it is a matter of record that none of the Secret Service men whose 'ineptitude' so strikingly manifested itself on November 22, 1963, were punished, even by demotion, and that some of them actually were promoted by the incoming Administration. The Warren Commission had no fault to find with this outrageous situation.

The Commission even went so far as to praise the advance preparations made by the Secret Service at Love Field and the Trade Mart as 'entirely adequate', thus drawing attention away from the glaring fact that the *motorcade* arrangements were adequate only for murder.

The *Dallas Times Herald* went one better than the Commission. On the frontpage of that afternoon paper, an early edition of which had been published at 10:30 a.m., i.e. two hours before the assassination, an editorial by Jim Lehrer paid glowing tribute to the efficiency of the Secret Service in guarding the President's life during his Dallas stay. For the next edition, out on the streets at 2:30 p.m., the headline and a few paragraphs of the story were changed in haste, while most of the original text was left standing, with this result:

SECRET SERVICE CHECKS IN VAIN

by Jim Lehrer
Staff Writer

Despite the extensive and painstaking steps taken by the vaunted Secret Service, tragedy struck in downtown Dallas.

The President's protectors had checked minutely on seemingly everything - the food the Kennedy's were to eat, the flowers they would sniff and admire, the friends who could cheer, the opponents who would jeer, the roads they would travel and the newsmen who would report the story.

TRAGICALLY, one link was missing.

The quiet-spoken, raincoat wearing men of the Secret Service had been the marvel this week of local law enforcement officers and other observers for their thoroughness.

First, there were several sites proposed initially for today's luncheon. Secret Service men checked them all.

THE BALCONIES of the Trade Mart, *the favorite of the local sponsors*,* made the security experts reluctant. But they studied and investigated some more and finally approved the Trade Mart site.

A list - by name - of known agitators in Dallas who might possibly be inclined to stir up trouble was obtained. Agents became familiar with them, their patterns.

A motorcade route was checked out next. Trouble spots were spotted both in traffic and possible crowd situations. . .

The article then went into arresting particulars of the 'detailed security measures' that had been taken at the Trade Mart. For example:

'Thursday morning agents probed through 5,000 yellow roses as they were being installed at the Trade Mart to ensure that no bombs or other damaging weapons were included with the fragrant odor. . .'

The exuberant wording and generally exalted tone of this eulogy, with its market emphasis on the 'thoroughness' of the 'vaunted' Secret Service, make it appear as a *whitewash prepared in advance*. Obviously somebody high up in the *Times Herald* hierarchy had a pretty good hunch about what was going to happen and had instructed Jim Lehrer to write a paean extolling the Secret Service to the point where people would stop noticing how badly the 'quiet-spoken, raincoat wearing' marvels of efficiency had fallen down on their job.

Why, hadn't they gone sniffing through 5,000 yellow roses? Think of the time and manpower required for that job alone - and it was only one of many checking operations! Can you blame such busy people for overlooking one tiny little item like the Texas School Book Depository - the 'tragically missing link'?

Jim Garrison has stated correctly that the assassination plan was well conceived and ably executed. Little was overlooked by the plotters in their advance planning and they took great care to blur any trails that might lead in their direction or

* I have italicized this passage which affords additional proof that the 'local sponsors' - or some of them, anyway - were involved in planning the Dealey Plaza ambush, a matter already discussed at some length in Chapter 7. - J.J.

point to any of their sponsors and accomplices. At least a score of red herrings, smokescreens, blinds and camouflages went into the operation and scores of others into the cover-up.

In this particular case, they overdid the eyewash a little, perhaps. It takes a heart of pure gold and eyes so blind as to make a bat look like Argus by comparison not to see that something is desperately wrong here. And it took a Warren Commission to believe the pious assurance of Secret Service Chief James J. Rowley that he just couldn't spare a man for a passing glance at the Texas School Book Depository, that towering fortress dominating the President's path, because they were all so busy checking 5,000 roses for concealed weapons.

The Secret Service couldn't spare a man either for checking the grassy knoll, a textbook location for a guerilla-type ambush. This breathtaking deficiency came to light when there were reports that a man who identified himself as a member of the Secret Service was encountered near the knoll just after the assassination.* These reports drew a firm denial from the Secret Service which stated explicitly that it had no man posted there. It would have been better for the Secret Service to have said that the knoll had been swarming with agents who didn't notice a damn thing than thus to admit another such glaring dereliction of duty.

The Warren Commission, faced with a staggering catalogue of Secret Service omissions, retreated into the least compromising area for administering a mild slap that couldn't possibly be avoided. Apart from suggesting - oh, ever so gently - that an attempt to cover only the most obvious points of possible ambush 'might well' have included the *TSBD* Building, the Report finds fault only with an apparent lack of liaison between the *FBI* and the Secret Service both of which, in the opinion of the seven sages, 'have too narrowly construed their respective responsibilities'.

Thereby the Commission attempts to shift the blame from the vast area of conspicuous and tangible dereliction of duty (failure to inspect and guard the *TSBD* and the grassy knoll;

* *New York Post*, March 8, 1967

assent to a motorcade route packed with obvious hazards; acceptance of the President's alleged wish to ride in an open car with the bubble top down and no bodyguards on running-boards etc. etc.) to the nebulous sphere of 'preventive intelligence research'.

The Secret Service and the *FBI* should have been more alert to the potentialities of Lee Harvey Oswald as a prospective assassin, the Commission holds. In the light of all that has already been brought out by the Garrison enquiry about the phony nature of Oswald's allegiance to communism, his close links to the *CIA* and the paramilitary right, and the fact that he was in constant touch with *FBI* agents in New Orleans as well as in Dallas, this contention looks even more ludicrous now than it did when the Report was first published.

To be sure, the Secret Service's preventive intelligence research was just as deficient as its checking operations, but it was not on account of their failure to tag Oswald as a potential assassin. On the contrary, it was because the Secret Service conspicuously failed to watch the activities, on the day of the president's visit to Dallas, of such notorious hatemongers and rabble rousers as the psychotic oil millionaire H. L. Hunt and the neo-Nazi general Edwin A. Walker, along with their armed cohorts of Minutemen, Klansmen, Nazi Party stormtroopers and John Birch Society agitators.

The Warren Commission actually thought of this, too, for their Report notes, with just a hint of eyebrow-raising, that the Secret Service's special file of 'cranks' and other potential suspects 'contained the names of no persons from the entire Dallas-Fort Worth area, notwithstanding the fact that Ambassador Adlai Stevenson had been abused by pickets in Dallas less than a month before.'

This statement, incidentally, gives the lie, unmistakably and irreconcilably to the previous Secret Service claim (as embodied in the above-cited *Dallas Times Herald* article) that 'a list - by name - of known agitators in Dallas. . . was obtained' and that 'agents became familiar with them. . .'

The Warren Commission also showed surprising leniency towards the most glaring, though by no means the most serious of all the violations of duty of which the Secret Service were

guilty in Dallas. It is a matter of record, undisputed and even admitted, that nine of the Secret Service men who were supposed to guard President Kennedy on his motorcade through Dallas went on a drinking spree, the night before, at nearby Fort Worth. Some of them stayed at the bar of the Fort Worth Press Club until 3 a.m. on November 22. This flagrant breach of discipline (to put it mildly) had been known widely since a day or two after the Kennedy murder.

Senator Stephen Young of Ohio, for one, declared in a statement published on December 3, 1963:

'I feel very incensed over this situation. Guarding the President is a 24-hour job. These men knew they had an assignment that required them to be alert mentally and capable physically.'

Sen. Young called for a trial of these delinquent agents on the grounds of 'neglect of duty' and added, 'If they are guilty and I had my way, I would see to it that they were separated from the service.'

It is also a matter of record that most, if not all of the Secret Service agents who were present in Dealey Plaza when the President was murdered showed evident signs of stupefaction. They were about as alert, mentally, as rhinos snoozing in the African sun.

One only has to glance at the famous picture which *AP* photographer James Altgens snapped the presidential limousine and the follow-up car filled with Secret Service men, the instant the first shot was fired, to realize that these men, who had been trained professionally to react with lightning speed to any attack on the President, were at that critical moment just bemused and benumbed. Most of them are still staring ahead, totally unconcerned, while two, with their backs to the camera, appear to be gazing straight at that mysterious figure in the doorway of the Texas School Book Depository who many observers believe was none other than Lee Harvey Oswald, though this is disputed by the *FBI* and the Warren Commission. Perhaps these two fellows look so frozen because they thought they were seeing a ghost, for Oswald definitely was not supposed to be in the doorway at that moment - not according to plan. Anyway, not one of them

shows any sign of awareness of danger; not one of them is reaching for his gun.

William Manchester described the scene in these terms:

'... The reflexes of the agents nearest the President were crucial in those seconds after the first shot was fired. . . They were in a position to take evasive action after the first shot, but for five terrible seconds they were immobilized.'

Immobilized by what? By the effects of the liquor they had been drinking? Or by any mental reservations?

A departmental trial could have brought out the truth about this episode as well as about all the other sins of commission and omission of which the Secret Service was guilty at Dallas. But no such trial was held. None of these men who bear such heavy responsibility for the death of the President had to endure so much as a mild reprimand. Says the Warren Report:

'Chief Rowley testified that under ordinary circumstances he would have taken disciplinary action against those agents who had been drinking in clear violation of the regulations. However, he felt that any disciplinary action might have given rise to an inference that the violation of the regulation had contributed to the tragic events of November 22. Since he was convinced that this was not the case, he believed that it would be unfair to the agents and their families to take explicit disciplinary measures. He felt that each agent recognized the seriousness of the infraction and that there was no danger of a repetition.'

Just on what does Mr. Rowley base his 'conviction' that the drinking bout of his agents the night before the murder did not 'contribute' to the killing of the President, when the opposite is self-evident? He didn't say so and the Warren Commission did not ask him. After a bit of sermonizing about the benefits of sobriety and sound sleep, the Report winds up the incident with these inane remarks:

'It is conceivable that those men who had little sleep, and who had consumed alcoholic beverages, even in limited quantities, might have been more alert in the Dallas motorcade if they had retired promptly in Fort Worth. However, there is no evidence that these men failed to take any action in Dallas

within their power that would have averted the tragedy. . . '

'It is conceivable'. . . 'there is no evidence'. . . the Commission always employs those weasel words when it is in a tough spot and doesn't quite know how to wriggle out of it without loss of dignity.

In fact, it is not only conceivable but dead sure that a presidential bodyguard who has not been drinking is quicker on the trigger than one who is bemused by liquor and lack of sleep. And there is plenty of evidence that these men failed to take the right action within their power which was to grab their machine guns and, to use the words of their own ex-Chief Baughman again, 'pepper the windows' of the *TSBD* whence one shot undoubtedly came, even though it was not perhaps the fatal one. Or they could have thrown themselves over the President to protect him with their bodies from further injury - as Secret Service Agent Rufus Youngblood did at that precise moment in Lyndon Johnson's limousine although it was not the target of a single bullet.

While I am satisfied that some of the Secret Service agents on the scene were implicated in the conspiracy and abetted the assassination through deliberate inaction, I feel equally certain that others were not privy to the plot and were totally unaware of what was going to happen. Some of these men 'conceivably' might have wanted to do the right thing and protect the President even at the risk of their own lives. This had to be avoided at all cost by the conspirators, for in an attempt of this kind it is essential to neutralize the defenders if success is to be achieved.

I firmly believe, therefore, that these innocent Secret Service men were deliberately 'doped' by their guilty colleagues with drink, sleeplessness and possibly drugs and thus reduced to a state of torpor when a maximum of alertness was needed. The drinking bout, therefore, was an integral part of the master plan. Now, maybe even if all these clearcut indications of Secret Service guilt are added up and carefully weighed, they still won't make, in the eyes of the law, a watertight case to support my charge of *complicity* rather than 'ineptitude'.

There is, however, in existence a document so damaging and so irrefutable that it virtually clinches the Case Against

the Secret Service. It is the so-called Miami tape, a matter described in detail in Chapter 35 of my book *Oswald: The Truth*. There is no need for me, therefore, to go again into details here.

To put it briefly, the Miami police got wind, through one of its confidential informers, that an attempt had been planned on the life of President Kennedy, shortly before his visit to that city on November 18, 1963 - four days before the Dallas tragedy. Unlike their Dallas counterparts, the Miami cops were sincerely concerned about the safety of the President and took measures to counter the threat. They vetoed plans for a motorcade through their city and persuaded Kennedy instead to travel by helicopter. Accordingly, nothing happened to him in Miami.

What is more, the Miami police, obtained through their informer a tape recording of a conversation between the latter and a Ku Klux Klan-type of terrorist concerning the plans to kill the President. In it, the Klansman candidly explained how such an assassination could be successfully accomplished. His formula for murder: Take a high-powered rifle, in disassembled form, into a tall office building, reassemble it there and fire from a window on the presidential parade.

The terrorist even forecast that nothing would happen to the real assassin. 'The police... will pick up somebody within hours afterward,' he said, '*just to throw the public off.*' Just as it happened in Dallas.

This conversation took place on November 9, 1963 - about two weeks before the President was slain. *And the tape recording of it was promptly forwarded through official channels to the Secret Service - which took no action.*

The authenticity of this episode cannot be doubted, for on February 3, 1967, the Miami police played the recording for a group of reporters. On the same date, the Associated Press put out a long story on it, the text of which will be found in *Oswald: The Truth*.

Nevertheless, these disclosures, which came two weeks before the first news of the Garrison enquiry broke - there was certainly a link between the two - hardly stirred more than a ripple of interest. Officialdom in Washington and large seg-

ments of the press simply ignored the whole thing.

The enormity of this episode is further underlined by the fact that the terrorist who had confided to a police informer this veritable blueprint of what was about to happen in Dallas was picked up by the FBI five days after the assassination of President Kennedy, questioned - and then released. Why? Simply because no link to Oswald could be found.

Here the naked, monstrous guilt of the Secret Service - and the FBI - hits you right between the eyes. Those fellows not only knew that a plan to kill the President was afoot, they had even be alerted - by a police department! - to important details of how the murder was to be carried out. What is more, they had learned the identity of one of the plotters and thus could easily have smashed the conspiracy. They didn't do it.

You call that 'ineptitude?' I call it complicity.

The shocking revelations about the existence of the Miami tapes have been in the record for months. So has been my formal accusation, made in *Oswald: The Truth*, that this incident alone proves conclusively that the Secret Service itself was implicated in the plot. It is a charge that has not been answered and it won't be answered, because it cannot be answered.

At that juncture, at the very latest, the Government in Washington was under a solemn obligation to take firm action against the delinquent Secret Service and the FBI. A thorough housecleaning was in order, starting from the top.

Instead, the Government turned its wrath on the courageous district attorney in New Orleans who, in his own words, was just 'doing the job they (the FBI and the Secret Service) should have done.' It put all its influence to work to hamper and discredit the Garrison enquiry.

And what would you call that? Ineptitude again?

Chapter 14

Operation 'Overkill'

Will we have to wait until Garrison reveals in a court of law what really happened in Dealey Plaza in order to know the whole truth? This author does not think so. The revelations that Garrison has already made, together with the work done by Mark Lane, Harold Weisberg and particularly Josiah Thompson, make it possible to reconstruct with a fair degree of accuracy what happened when Kennedy took that fatal turn into Elm Street. A little intelligent guess work is required, but the solution to the crime which I am now about to put forward will be found to fit exactly with the testimony of every eye-witness, and what is more important it will completely eliminate all the inconsistencies and contradictions in the evidence which have to date baffled almost every student of the assassination. It will do so by explaining them, not by explaining them away, as did the Warren Report.

If this solution is totally at variance with that first propounded by the Dallas Police and District Attorney, then taken over by the FBI, then retouched by the Warren Commission, and finally embellished by William Manchester - then I am not to blame. The reason is that all of these worthies knowingly and wilfully disregarded the facts available to them: ignored or distorted the material evidence: arbitrarily dismissed the testimony of eye-witnesses: and conspired with each other to suppress the truth, pervert the course of justice and shield the real assassins of President Kennedy.

If I knew how to phrase my accusation in stronger terms, I would do so.



Dealey Plaza, in Dallas, is a large, roughly pear-shaped expanse of lawns and greenery on the western edge of the big

city, landscaped with pergolas and arcades and surrounded on three sides by tall, massive structures. To the northwest lies a large railway yard and the western side of the Plaza is closed in by a railway embankment which is pierced by the triple underpass. This enables the three converging streets Main, Commerce and Elm, to reach the open country beyond. Screening the railway yard from the Plaza is a grassy slope, studded with trees and bushes, along the top of which runs a picket fence. It has become famous as the grassy knoll. Between it and the Depository is a crescent shaped concrete arcade with an octagonal pergola at either end. It stands back about seventy or eighty feet from the road. The Depository itself dominates the northeast corner of the Plaza. It is a massive, square, structure that looks directly south over the Plaza and towers to a height of nearly a hundred feet. White stone walls fan out from either end of the arcade, that furthest from the Depository descending the slope almost at right angles to the road. A flight of concrete steps leads up from the pavement and disappears between this stone wall and the picket fence behind it. Behind the fence is a parking lot belonging to the Dallas Sheriff's Office and situated in fact in the railway yard. (See map on page 187.)

The Presidential motorcade debouched into Dealey Plaza from Main Street. It then immediately turned right into Houston Street and after travelling north for a short space made a very sharp left hand turn into Elm Street. At this point Elm Street follows a curve, on a slight downward grade, which leads it almost diagonally away from the corner of the Plaza. It was from a window immediately overlooking this corner that Oswald is supposed to have fired. As we shall see in a moment, only one shot at the most was fired from that window and it was certainly not fired by Oswald.

There are two ways, in the main, of carrying out an assassination. The first, employed by fanatics prepared to sacrifice themselves, is to break through the security cordon and attack with bomb, knife, or pistol at point-blank range. It depends for its success on the element of surprise and on the laxity of the security guards. The second, is to pick off the intended victim at long range with a sniper's rifle. This method depends

on concealment, surprise and the one hundred per cent accuracy of the *first* shot, since a second shot is usually out of the question. In the case of Kennedy's assassination which was, strictly speaking, more of an execution by a firing squad, both methods were used. In a strange way this is inherent in the very fact that a lone fanatic was produced although the method he was supposed to have employed was not the fanatical one. Moreover, he was supposed to have fired three shots, although he had only been *seen* to fire one. And he was not arrested on the scene of the crime but over an hour later. It was obvious from the very first that something was wrong somewhere.

As Kennedy's car made that left turn into Elm Street, it was in fact about to carry him, I believe, into the most lethal death trap ever devised for the elimination of a single individual. The plan which the conspirators had devised bears all the hall-marks of a mind of almost devilish ingenuity. Knowing that one cannot guarantee success with only one shot, or even with two or three, this evil genius, who was almost certainly David Ferrie,* had stationed no less than five, and possibly even six gunmen, all with pistols or rifles at the ready, at different points of the compass where each could bring his sights to bear on the victim at precisely the same moment. For this was the essence of the plan. If a number of shots were to be fired at exactly the same instant, the bystanders and eye-witnesses would be unaware that more than one shot had been fired. In the event of none of these shots inflicting a fatal wound then a second round of fire would be called for, this time from a different set of gunmen. Time would have to be allowed for a lone sniper to reload and resight a bolt-action rifle, say about five or six seconds, and in that time the car would naturally have moved on about seventy-five feet. Whilst the members of the first firing squad were concealing themselves and their weapons, the second squad, consisting this time of three men, would bring into action and complete the execution of the victim. One of them

* He died on Wednesday, 22 February, 1967, in mysterious circumstances. James Garrison had intended to arrest him the following week.

would be firing from a position so close to the car that he would be almost unable to miss.

The reader will probably ask in astonishment how such a plan could possibly have been put into effect. Let me repeat, it was devised by a mind of devilish ingenuity. Garrison specifically stated in his interview with *Playboy* that 'it was a precision operation and was carried out coolly and with excellent coordination; the assassins even kept in contact by radio.' Those last five words contain the clue to the whole mystery. Why should it have been necessary for the gunmen to keep in contact by radio? Anyone who has ever sat in on a radio net consisting of a control and several sub-stations all operating on the same channel will know that this system of communication is often fraught with confusion, frustration and delay. Besides, what possible information could the assassins have wanted to pass to one another? They would hardly have been conducting a quiz-game or issuing weather reports. No, we only have to remember that the essence of the plan was for the shots to be fired with precision timing, and the situation becomes crystal clear. The exact moment had to be determined by the progress of the car and there had to be someone in a position to observe when it had reached the pre-determined point. There are two sets of broken white lines denoting traffic lanes painted down the centre of Elm Street. The signal was to be given when the front wheels of the car reached the fourth stripe from the corner.*

What this meant was that someone had to be standing near the side of the road within a few yards of this point carrying a portable radio and in full view of bystanders. Could such a person have done so without attracting attention? I believe that he could and he did. Let us see if we can find him.

* A picture taken by an AP photographer called Altgens, at the moment of the first shot, clearly shows that this was the precise position of Kennedy's car. The Commission asserted that this picture corresponds with frame 255 in Zapruder's film and that it had been taken at the moment of the second shot. (They tried to persuade Altgens that he had not noticed the first shot). They were only able to do this by removing the right hand half of the picture, thus making it impossible to locate the exact position of the car. This truncated picture appears on the cover.

Philip Willis, a Dallas car salesman, was one of the witnesses to the shooting. He had taken his daughters out of school so that they could watch the President drive past and he was recording the scene with his camera. At the moment that he pressed the trigger for his fifth photograph he heard what he thought was one shot ring out. He was using colour film because it was a brilliantly sunny day and the colours would come out clearly. They did. Across the street and further down, a few yards ahead of the President's car, can be seen a man holding an open black umbrella above his head although the sky was a beautiful cloudless blue. Why? He would hardly have been using it as a parasol, and besides, he can be seen in a photograph taken seconds later, just after the shooting was over, strolling off unconcernedly up Elm Street with his umbrella *furled*. And this man has never been identified.

Now everyone knows that in this age of miniaturisation, wirelasses can easily be concealed on one's person. To addicts of the 'Man from U.N.C.L.E.' or James Bond this is elementary. Even transmitters, provided they only have a very short range, can be slipped into a breast pocket without making an obvious bulge. There is just one problem, however, and that is to conceal the aerial. But can anyone think of a better way of doing so than to disguise it as an umbrella? What in fact convinces me that this umbrella was a disguised aerial is that Garrison, not long after his investigation had become public knowledge, pointed to this umbrella in a photograph projected on a wall of his office and, turning to a group of journalists who were present, said: 'There, gentlemen, is the murder weapon.' The journalists were, of course, dumbfounded and some of them concluded that this was merely further evidence that Garrison was mad. Not one of them suspected that this was the all important clue, which, once you have grasped its significance, enables one to elucidate every other aspect of the mystery.

To comprehend exactly what was happening, it has to be kept firmly in mind that two things were going on at the same time. On the one hand a gang of hired assassins, most of them crack shots, were gunning down the leader of the western

world with ruthless efficiency and leaving nothing to chance. On the other hand the world was being fooled into believing that something totally different was happening, namely that a demented lone assassin was wreaking his revenge on society by an act of madness. The inherent improbability of this was to be masked by an elaborate plan of deception and by the elimination of all clues that would point in another direction. As I have already indicated, the most important part of this deception plan was for the five or six guns employed in the first volley to fire as one.

A rifleman with one eye closed and the other glued to his telescopic sight can see nothing except the target at which he is aiming and cannot therefore respond to a visual signal. If he is to fire to order, he will have to rely on an audio-signal. Each sniper would, therefore, have had a small radio-receiver resting close to one ear and tuned into the transmitting frequency used by the man with the umbrella. Let us now see if we can determine from the *known* evidence how many assassins there were and where they fired from. If we can do this, we will then see to what extent the pattern that emerges fits in with what the bystanders saw and heard.

The first thing to get clear is that there is not a shred of evidence to show that the initial shot came from Oswald's window. A shot may have come from that building but not necessarily from that window. In fact, the evidence shows conclusively that it did not.

If we look at the evidence provided by the wounds, we will get our first and most important clues. The throat wound which, as all the doctors at Parkland Hospital said, was a wound of entry, clearly indicates a shot from in front whereas the wound in the back, five and a half inches below the collar line can only have been caused by a shot from behind. Sibert and O'Neill, the two FBI agents attending the autopsy, and whose whereabouts the FBI now refuses to disclose, reported that the bullet entered the body at an angle of between 40° and 60°. (That this wound was in the back and not in the neck as stated by the Warren Report is shown by the Report filed and signed by Sibert and O'Neill, the chart prepared by Commander Boswell, who was one of the Doctors carry-

ing out the autopsy, and the position of the bullet holes in Kennedy's coat and shirt. It is also confirmed by the testimony of a Secret Service agent who was in the car behind.) There is only one point behind Kennedy from which a bullet with such a trajectory could have been fired and that is from the top of the clock on the roof of the Book Depository.

'The exact time of the assassination was fixed by the testimony of four witnesses,' says the Warren Report. 'Special Agent Rufus W. Youngblood observed that the large electric sign clock stop the Texas School Book Depository showed the numerals "12.30", as the Vice-Presidential automobile proceeded north on Houston Street, a few seconds before the shots were fired.' Now there is only one point on that trip up Houston Street from which Youngblood could have told the time from that clock and that is immediately upon emerging from Main Street. The angle at which the clock faces, and its height above ground totally precludes his having done so at any later point. The clock was therefore the first thing in Dealey Plaza that Youngblood looked at. Why? Are we to suppose that Special Agents are not equipped with reliable watches?

Secret Service agents have but one duty and that is to protect the lives of the President and Vice-President. They travel in motorcades for the precise purpose of spotting snipers in upper floor windows. Only an agent who was half asleep could have failed to see Oswald at that window if he had really been there, and yet Youngblood acted with an alacrity shown by no other agent that day as soon as the first shot was heard. He leapt on top of Lyndon Johnson, forcing him to the floor of the car. Rufus Youngblood has recently been promoted to a top position in the Secret Service by the master whom he served so well. Johnson has in fact paid public tribute in the most glowing terms to his outstanding sense of public duty.

Next let us examine the photographic evidence. The most important was provided by Abraham Zapruder, an amateur movie enthusiast who was filming the procession with a 8mm. cine camera from the top of a concrete plinth at the western

end of the arcade. He kept his finger on the button from the moment the motorcade first came into view until after the last shots were fired. Unfortunately, a large road sign obscured his view of the Presidential car at the precise moment that the first volley was fired. Frame no. 207 of the film he took, which until recently has been suppressed but which is published for the first time in Dr. Josiah Thompson's book *Six Seconds in Dallas*, shows a dark spot on the back of this sign in a direct line with Kennedy's throat. Kennedy's head is still visible above the top of the sign. At that moment it was turned and he was facing directly towards Zapruder, that is to his right front. Frames 209 and 210 of the film (it was running at a speed of 18.3 frames per second), which were also suppressed, show that the two upright supports of the sign have suddenly doubled in width, which would indicate that they were vibrating at very high speed. The dark spot does not reappear in any of the frames prior or subsequent to frame 207. But we shall never be able to check whether or not there is a bullet hole in the sign at that point because it was removed half an hour later and nobody has since been able to discover its whereabouts.*

If there is a bullet hole there, it would mean that someone had fired from immediately behind Zapruder. If we examine the Willis photograph referred to above we can see that Zapruder was standing right in front of an octagonal concrete pergola which rounds off the arcade. To one side of it are a number of apertures, each of which would have provided an ideal loophole for a sniper, and that a wisp of smoke appears to be issuing from one of these.

Zapruder himself maintained at the time that the shots had

* James Hicks, who testified before the New Orleans grand jury on 11 January, 1968, told reporters as he entered the jury room that he had witnessed the assassination. He had heard four shots and one bullet had come over his head and struck a traffic sign. Later he had seen the sign being removed by men whom he had assumed to be members of the Dallas police force. On the night before he gave his evidence, Hicks was attacked in his hotel room by two negroes, and thrown through a glass door onto a balcony. He had also been threatened on the telephone.

come from right behind him, although the Warren Commission were later to force him to concede that he didn't know where the shots had come from. But it is not really surprising that they were able to do this, as we shall shortly see.

We have now pinpointed two of the snipers. Let's see if we can find any more. Perhaps the other Zapruder frames that were suppressed will be able to help us, nos. 211 and 212. Slightly to the right of the road sign already mentioned but on the far side of Elm Street can be seen the slender trunk of a lone tree. At the top of the frame can be seen the foliage on its lower branches, about eight feet from the ground. The branches of this tree would in fact have provided a perfect vantage point from which to have shot the President at the spot that he had reached when the shooting occurred. The foliage was thick enough to have concealed a gunman and yet not so thick as to have concealed his target from him. Since Kennedy had no wounds that would correspond to a shot from that direction, then it follows that if such a shot had been fired it must have missed, even though the range cannot have been more than twelve yards, and hit the sidewalk on the north side of Elm Street. There would therefore be a corresponding bullet mark on the side walk. Was there one?

In 1966 Harold Weisberg discovered an FBI report (CD 1546) in the Commission archives which stated that a certain Mr. Aldredge had 'telephonically advised' the Dallas office of the FBI on 29 September, 1964, of his disagreement with the Warren Report because of a bullet mark that the Commission had failed to take note of. He had seen this bullet mark pointed out on a TV programme shortly after the assassination and had been to see it himself about three months previously. He had found it in the middle of the sidewalk on the north side of Elm Street and described it as approximately six inches long. He was sure that it had been caused by a bullet and reported that Carl Freund, a reporter on the *Dallas Morning News*, had also stated that it was a bullet mark. He said that it was about eight feet (could he have said yards?) to the east of a lamp post.

It will be noted that Aldredge gave his telephonic advice to the FBI after the Report had been published and he does not therefore feature in that august document. No doubt he had assumed that the FBI knew a bullet mark when they saw one and that they would have thoroughly combed the area for any such marks. His faith in the FBI can, in the circumstances, only be regarded as touching. Had he pointed out this mark to them earlier, then in all probability the Warren Commission would have employed the device used to discredit other witnesses with embarrassing evidence to offer. They would have discovered that his school record showed that he was given to lying or else that he was habitually drunk and was given to telephoning when watching television.

The FBI did not, however, totally ignore him. The day after his call they sent two agents down to Dealey Plaza to look at this strange bullet mark. They found it 33 feet (or 11 yards) to the east of the second lamp post. It was 'an approximately four inches by one-half inch wide dug-out scar, which could possibly have been made by some blunt-end type instrument or projectile.' Notice the careful avoidance of the word bullet. And now comes the big laugh. 'This scar,' they added, 'lies in such a direction that if it had been made by a bullet, it could not have come from the direction of the window. . . used by Lee Harvey Oswald when firing his assassination bullets at the late President.' Exactly!

Where then did it come from? If we trace the line back from point of impact and past Kennedy's head, it leads directly to the tree. The only building from which such a shot could have been fired was the Criminal Courts Building and there is nowhere in that building from which an assassin's view of the President would not have been blocked by the tree at that moment.

The curious fact is that in these two suppressed frames of the Zapruder film, 211 and 212, we *can* see a shape that could be that of a man sitting on a branch. But what is even more curious is the fact that the tree which stands on that exact spot today is quite a different tree to the one that stood there on the 22 November 1963. The present tree is not nearly so tall and its branches and foliage are quite impenetrable to

the human eye. This is even evident in the Warren Report where frame 210 is reproduced, although it is so blurred and badly printed that on its own it reveals almost nothing. But compare it with a photograph taken during the re-enactment of the crime from the same place that Zapruder was standing, and it reveals all, despite the fact that the intention can only have been to obscure. Even though, in this case, one can only see the lower branches of the tree it is quite apparent that there is a marked difference between the two trees. The most striking difference is that to the right of the trunk where the man-like figure appears in the Zapruder film, and where plenty of light filters through, the foliage of the tree in the re-enactment picture is represented by a *solid* black. But there are other differences obvious even to someone who knows nothing about trees. The tree in the second picture is clearly of a different species and the conformation of the branches is not the same.

Nor is this all. Photographs that actually appear in the Warren Report, and which therefore cannot have been taken long after the assassination, show that the two large trees nearest to this one lone tree, those in fact that would have provided the casual observer with an instant comparison of height, have been replaced by two dwarf trees or bushes.

Corroborating evidence that a bullet came from the lone tree is provided by the statements of Royce Skelton on the underpass, and Mrs. D. S. Baker who was standing on the kerb near the Depository, both of whom testified to seeing a bullet strike the sidewalk where the bullet-mark now is.

We now have three possible gunmen. I shall deal with the other three in the first strike much more rapidly since they have been discovered by other authors or by Garrison. Garrison may have discovered the snipers on the clock, in the pergola, and in the tree for himself, indeed I feel sure that he has, but he has never mentioned them. I can therefore claim the credit of discovering them for myself, even though I cannot produce *cast-iron* proof that they were there. The other snipers were located as follows: There was one firing from a window in the Dal-Tex building across the street from the Book Depository. His bullet missed and struck the curb

near the underpass on the south side of Main Street. A straight line drawn between these two points passes within a fraction of Kennedy's head at the moment of the first shot. Another sniper was hidden behind the stone wall that runs down from the end of the arcade. He had with him an accomplice whose job it was to pick up the ejected cartridge as soon as the shot was fired. Garrison claims that he has a photograph which shows these two in position and I see no reason to disbelieve him. It is possible that Kennedy's throat wound was caused by the bullet from this weapon, but if this was the shot that Zapruder heard, it would have come from his right and not from behind him. At this point in time it is impossible to say what became of these two assassins as they were obviously not behind the wall seconds later when a crowd of bystanders rushed up the slope and passed between the wall and the fence. Could it be that they slipped their rifle and radio through a hole in the fence to an accomplice waiting behind and then strolled out into the open and down the slope as if nothing had happened? If so, this would explain the two characters standing on the steps behind Emmett Hudson, the groundsman, at the moment that the second volley was fired. At any rate, no one has ever discovered who they were. They stand, hands in pockets, nonchalant and unmoved as the top of Kennedy's head is blown off, although Hudson is obviously reacting violently, as can be seen in the photograph taken by Mary Moorman.

The sixth sniper, whose existence is clearly demonstrated by Josiah Thompson in *Six Seconds in Dallas*, was on top of the Records Building, on the east side of Dealey Plaza. Of the five snipers dealt with so far, we know that two scored hits, two missed and the other bullet is not accounted for. If the umbrella gives us the clue to what really happened or was meant to happen in Dealey Plaza, then the fate of this next and sixth bullet gives us the explanation of everything that happened thereafter. For without that bullet there would have been no Warren Report and no Garrison Enquiry. Oswald would have been tried and convicted for a crime which he never committed. He would have gone to the electric chair, and no one would ever have been any the wiser.

For the fact of the matter is that that bullet missed its target and hit Governor Connally. But what is even more important is that, for a reason which we may never know, and which we don't even need to know, this shot was fired the best part of a second after the other five. This fact has been proved up to the hilt by Josiah Thompson even though he is quite unaware that there were five snipers shooting when the first shot was fired and that no one fired from Oswald's window at that moment. The cardinal importance of this fact is that, because Connally was struck before a lone assassin could possibly have had time to reload and resight, the whole myth of a single gunman was in instant jeopardy of being exposed. And, moreover, several bystanders heard two separate shots instead of the one shot which they were supposed to hear.

Six shots have now been fired. Connally and Kennedy have both been wounded. The controller of the operation, watching from beneath the umbrella which is shielding him from the non-existent rain, and perfectly positioned to observe the effect of the shots, instantly realises that a further volley is called for from the second team of assassins. It is at this point that a rifleman steps forward from the shadows behind Oswald's window and takes aim. It is an elementary rule, taught at all the best sniper's schools, that if you are trying to pick off someone in an open space where he is surrounded by people and where armed security guards are present, you never fire twice from the same place. This is so obvious, so fundamental, so completely self-evident, that this fact alone will astound future generations when they attempt to work out how the Warren Commission succeeded in bamboozling the world into believing that Oswald fired, not two, but *three* shots and from a window at which he was completely exposed to the view of the crowd below. If the slower-witted have failed to grasp the point, let me quote from the Jarnagin document which is set out in my book *Oswald: The Truth*, at the moment where Ruby and Crafard are discussing the best vantage point from which to shoot Governor Connally during a public parade through the streets of Dallas.

LEE (i.e. Crafard): 'Where can I do the job?'

RUBY: 'From the roof of some building.'

LEE: 'No, that's too risky, too many people around.'

RUBY: 'But they'll be watching the parade, they won't notice you.'

LEE: 'But afterwards, they would tear me to pieces before I could get away.'

And further on, when Ruby suggests that Crafard use a back door by which to make a hurried escape, Crafard replies: 'It doesn't open onto an open fire escape does it? I don't want to run out onto an open fire escape with a rifle in my hand right after the shooting.'

Crafard, at any rate, understood what happens to an assassin who is caught by an infuriated mob.

For the benefit of those who have still not grasped the point, let me spell it out completely. A lone gunman firing from a concealed sniper's nest knows that he has a very good chance of getting in one shot before his presence is detected or even suspected. No one will be looking his way and he can rely on the element of surprise. Having fired that one shot, however, the element of surprise will have gone and what is more the noise made by his gun will have attracted attention in his direction. The second shot will therefore almost certainly give away his position completely and destroy any chance that he might have had of escaping without being apprehended. The people who planned Kennedy's execution were only too well aware of this fact. Of the nine possible gunmen, not one, I believe, fired a second shot.

One of the oddest things about the whole discussion of the Kennedy assassination is that no one has ever seen fit to mention the two completely separate sounds heard by anyone who is standing close to the path of a bullet. He hears first the crack as it parts the air close to him, a sharp and unmistakable sound, and then after an interval, the length of which depends on his distance from the rifle, the sound of the actual discharge. The crack of the bullet gives no indication as to its source but it alerts anyone who hears it to the fact that bullets are flying about. The thump made by the

discharge however, will immediately make the general direction of the source quite apparent. Anyone recognising it for what it is will at once wheel around towards it, if only from the natural and very powerful instinct of self-preservation. It can therefore be said with the utmost certainty that neither the first, nor the second, shot came from Oswald's window for the simple reason that numerous people would have been bound to have seen him at the window. And when we consider the astonishing fact that several people saw a man at that window with a rifle in his hand only a matter of seconds before the motorcade came in sight, the fact that only two of them looked back at that window speaks volumes. Only a totally half-witted assassin would have displayed himself in this way before taking the first shot. A man who could fire three shots at the President with deadly accuracy from an exposed window and then get clean away from the scene of the crime without being caught, as Oswald was supposed to have done, could not possibly be a half-wit.

Let me repeat, in case the reader is confused. The so-called first shot was not one shot but five different shots fired from five different directions on the order of the central radio control. The so-called second shot was in fact a sixth shot fired late by a gunman who failed to synchronise his fire with the other five. And the *third* shot was the *second* volley.

The second team of assassins are now preparing to fire while the controller counts the seconds that will allow the mythical lone sniper to reload and reaim. He counts to five and then breathes the codeword into a microphone disguised as a wristwatch or slung around his neck. Three shots ring out, one from the Oswald window, another from behind the picket fence and a third from the side of the road. Possibly there were others, but we have no evidence of this. We know about the first because Howard Brennan saw the sniper as he fired his shot as, no doubt, he was intended to. The second has been convincingly proved to have existed by Josiah Thompson from the photographic and eyewitness evidence. Besides, Garrison again claims to have photographs which show three men behind the picket fence. The third was first mentioned in a letter, of which I received a copy, sent in April,

1964, to the Warren Commission by Miss Lillian Costellano. According to her a man crouching in a storm drain fired up through the grating at very short range. Garrison confirmed this during an interview on the Dallas Television station in December, 1967. Afterwards, he said, he escaped by ducking down and crawling through 30 inch and 18 inch sewage pipes. It was his shot that gave the coup de grâce. Garrison has not disclosed the evidence which he has to back this assertion but it fits so perfectly into the pattern of the master plan, that I see no reason to doubt his word. As far as one can tell from the plans of Dealey Plaza there was probably just such a manhole about a yard to the east of the third lamp-post on the north side of Elm Street. The cars and motorcycles coupled with the curvature of the road would have ensured that practically no one saw him. But evidently *someone* did.

In a matter of five seconds, from the first to the ninth shot, it was all over. As Garrison has described it, it was an overkill operation with nothing left to chance. Kennedy had never had a prayer.

Now let us turn to what the eye-witnesses saw and heard. If their evidence dovetails with what I have written above, and does not conflict with it in any way, then I would submit that this account is the first ever to be published to bear the mark of verisimilitude. In my previous books on the subject I concentrated on the evidence of conspiracy and was content to leave the actual details of the shooting to other writers. I had a rough idea of what had happened but now I have been able to fill in the final details with the help of Garrison's disclosures and the work of Josiah Thompson.

Clearly, we cannot here embark on a lengthy analysis of each individual witness's evidence. For the curious, Thompson's book has an Appendix in which it is all set out in tabular form. But what we can do is examine it in order to see if there is any pattern that emerges from it. One of the most baffling features of the assassination has, up to the present time, been the fact that no one has been able to find any sort of pattern in this evidence. It is a jumble of mutually incompatible and conflicting statements. But perhaps we now have the key

to this mystery. Let's see.

There are one hundred and ninety witnesses who were questioned as to what they saw and heard and of these only thirtysix were actually questioned on the day of the assassination. A further fifteen were questioned the following day and another eighteen within the following week. All the others were questioned weeks, and more often months after the event and their impressions cannot therefore be regarded as being very reliable. A study of the evidence of these witnesses, however, reveals two things with startling clarity. The vast majority, that is to say one hundred and thirtysix, heard three shots. A further ten said they heard two or three, and five said they heard three or four. Twentyone gave a higher or lower estimate and eighteen had no opinion to offer.

The second factor to emerge is that only sixtyfour or roughly one third of the witnesses had any idea as to where the shots had come from. Of these, thirtythree said that they came from the knoll and twentyfive from the Book Depository. Six had other opinions. In most cases it is perfectly clear that the witnesses were completely bewildered as to where the shots were coming from and one very significant feature of the evidence is that hardly anyone described the first shot as a sharp report.* Witness after witness (at least fiftytwo, of whom nine were secret servicemen who should know a rifle shot when they hear one) said that he had thought someone had thrown a firecracker; two described it as fireworks, some as a motorcycle backfire, and two or three as an explosion although they had no idea where it came from. Quite a number said that the last two shots sounded different to the first.

One of the silliest points made by Mr. John Sparrow in his denunciation of the critics of the Warren Report published in the *Times Literary Supplement* was that Lee Bowers, who was in a signal tower right outside Dealey Plaza, stated that he was unable to distinguish the difference between sounds coming from the east end of Elm Street and those

* The only one to do so was in fact President Johnson.

that came from near the underpass. To Sparrow's way of thinking, this indicated that the shots that were heard from the grassy knoll could simply have been echoes. Furthermore, he accuses Mark Lane of being deliberately selective in his use of the evidence because he omitted this irrelevant statement of Bowers. A child of six knows that echoes can be obtained off cliffs and high places because soundwaves bounce off a hard surface in the same way that lightwaves bounce off a mirror. It is perfectly obvious that the west face of the Book Depository would provide a mirror for sounds coming from near the underpass to anyone in or near Bowers' tower. And Bowers stated flatly that, for this reason, he was unable to determine the source of the shots. What applies to Bowers, however, quite clearly does not apply to the people actually in Dealey Plaza. Grassy tree-covered slopes simply do not give off echoes, and it is astonishing that a Warden of All Souls should not know this.

Almost more important than the source of the shots, is the fact that most people were under the impression that they were not evenly spaced. For the Report to be true Oswald had to have fired three shots in the space of 5.6 seconds at the most, and the rifle he was using could not, even in the hands of experts, be reloaded and reaimed in less than 2.3 seconds. This meant that there had to be almost exactly even spacing between the shots. And yet, of all the witnesses in Dealey Plaza only thirteen described them as evenly spaced. Forty said that the second and third shots were bunched, seven described the first two shots as bunched and five said that the first two and the last two were bunched. The rest appear not to have had any opinion, but a number of them described the shots as being far too close together to be rifle fire. Merriman Smith, the UPI reporter in a car close behind the President, spoke of an automatic rifle,* and others men-

* William Manchester in *The Death of a President* says the following of Smith: "Smith was not as astute a reporter as he seemed. Despite extensive experience with weapons he had thought the sounds in the plaza were three shots from an automatic weapon, and in a subsequent message he identified them as 'bursts'." And just how many bursts make three?

tioned fireworks. The earliest printed account of the assassination which appeared in the 2.30 p.m. edition of the *Dallas Times Herald* that day stated: 'Witnesses said six or seven shots were fired. The bursts were clearly heard.'

In examining the evidence, we must remember that sound travels at between 300 and 350 yards per second, and thus someone standing 75 yards from the source of one shot will hear it approximately a quarter of a second before he hears a second shot fired 150 yards away at exactly the same moment. Conversely, anyone standing at the centre of a circle (see page 186) on the perimeter of which a number of shots are fired at the same moment, will hear the report of each gun simultaneously. If, however, some of the shots are fired from beyond the edge of the circle and some from inside it, he will be likely to hear not one sharp report, but a ragged, crackling sound, something like a firecracker. On the other hand, a man standing outside the circle in such a position that the distance between him and each separate gunman varies considerably, would be likely to hear a number of separate shots, even though there might only be a split second interval between each. It is also worth bearing in mind that the source of a sound can only be determined by ear when the sound reaches the hearer in a straight line from its source. For example, someone at a window of a building, who hears a shot fired from another building in the street, and on the same side of the street, will have only a somewhat vague idea as to its source. Equally, a shot fired from around a corner would be impossible to pin down to its origin.

We should also remember that the first shot or shots took everyone completely by surprise, and it is perfectly clear that most of the witnesses did not react until after Kennedy was hit in the head, because they simply did not know what was happening. This can be seen from the photographs and the Zapruder film. They all knew they had heard a loud noise, but did not know what it was. What they, in fact, had heard was a volley of five shots followed at once by a single shot. And the volley would have made far more noise than the single shot that came immediately after it. Most people would have been deafened by the volley and would hardly have

noticed the sixth shot as a separate sound. Later we shall come to the testimony of Howard Brennan but there is one line from that which is worth quoting here in this context: 'Something, *just right after* this explosion, made me think that it was a firecracker,' and further on he says 'I do not know what made me think that there was firecrackers. . . unless I did hear the second shot. . . subconsciously I must have heard a second shot, but I do not recall it.'

Taking as our hypothesis that nine shots were fired, from the positions I have indicated, in two separate volleys, let us attempt to determine what the people in Dealey Plaza would be likely to have heard. Then let us see what in fact they did hear. If we look at the locations of the witnesses we will find that they fall into six main groups, apart from those actually in the motorcade itself (See page 187). They are as follows:

- A) Those on top of the triple underpass.
- B) Those by the side of the road between the car and the arcade.
- C) Those on the steps or near the front of the Book Depository.
- D) Those in the angle between Elm and Houston Street near the pool.
- E) Those at the southeast corner of the Elm and Houston junction.
- F) Those near the corner of Houston and Main Street.

Let us take first then the witnesses who were outside the circle of fire, i.e. those in groups A and F. There were fourteen witnesses in group A, on the underpass. Assuming my hypothesis to be correct one would expect to find that they had heard the first volley almost as a rolling drumbeat, and that they had then heard the shot from behind the fence followed almost immediately by the shot from the Depository. One would also expect to find that one or two with sharper hearing would hear four shots and that those with poor hearing or poor memories would have difficulty in stating how many shots were fired. It is precisely this pattern that emerges: seven heard three shots, two heard four shots, one

heard between two and three shots and three had no opinion. Richard Dodd said that the 'sounds were very close together', but he was unable to count them. Royce Skelton heard two shots closely bunched, and then another two also closely bunched. He said that he thought they were fireworks. George A. Davis said that the shots did not sound like rifle fire, as they came very close together, and he also was unable to count them. Five of these witnesses saw smoke rising either from above the trees in front of the Depository or from under the trees on the grassy knoll. The direction would have been the same in either case.

One would also expect to find that these witnesses had had very little idea as to the source of the shots. Some of them would no doubt have detected the shots coming from the knoll, but generally speaking their impression would have been of shots from the northeast corner of the Plaza. What then do we find? Of the fourteen, nine could not identify the source. Of the other five, two thought they came from the knoll, one *thought* he had heard shots from the Depository, and the Dal-Tex Building as well as from the knoll and another thought that they came from the general area of the northeast corner.

There were thirtyeight witnesses in group F, on the corner of Main and Houston Street, either in the street or near windows. As most of them would have been shielded from the shots fired from the northwest corner of Dealey Plaza, it would be logical to suppose that very few of them would have been able to determine the source of the shots, but a few of them would have been able to detect those *shots* coming from the knoll. Here again the pattern fits exactly. Five said that the shots came from the knoll, one said that they came from the northeast corner and the other thirtytwo were unable to determine where they came from.

Let us look now at the number of shots they heard. One would expect to find the same pattern emerging as that at the underpass, and in fact it comes out even more clearly. Of these thirtyeight, thirtyfive heard three shots and fifteen of these heard the second and third shots closely bunched. In other words we can probably assume that the first volley

was thought by almost all of them to be one shot, but that they were almost all able to distinguish two shots in the second volley. Of the other three, one heard two shots and two had no opinion to offer.

We turn now to the groups located within our circle of fire. Group B was strung in a line along the side of the road. Those near to the centre of the line were almost exactly at the middle of the circle and we would therefore expect to find that most of them would have no idea as to where the first shot came from, and that those furthest from the Depository would be likely to have heard the shots from behind them more clearly than those from other directions. This again proves to be the case. Of the fifteen in this group, eleven had no idea as to the source of the shot and three said that it came from the knoll. One of these in fact was the furthest from the Depository. Miss Karen Westbrook who was exactly opposite the car at the moment of the first shot heard what she described as an explosion. Mary Woodward, standing a few yards further down the road thought that the first shot came from above and behind her, which might indicate the western end of the arcade, and that the second shot came from the underpass, which might indicate the picket fence. Charles Hester who was standing on the slope near the eastern end of the arcade heard two shots which he thought came from 'immediately behind us and over our heads'.

Although these people were close to the centre of the circle, they were by no means equi-distant from the source of each shot. Those near the centre of the line would be likely to have distinguished only two shots, unless they had remarkably good hearing, whereas those to one side would be likely to have heard three or more. At the western end of the line they would have been more likely to have heard two shots together followed by a single shot and at the eastern end a single shot followed by two together. Yet again the record of the witnesses fits exactly (see chart). Six heard three shots but as we reach the centre of the line we find witnesses who either had no opinion or who heard between two or three shots or who *thought* they heard more than two shots. Mr. Millican, whose hearing must have been extremely acute,

and who was right in the centre of the line, heard eight shots. He said that the first three came from the Depository, the next two came from the arcade behind him, and the following three from the knoll. Although this does not fit in exactly with our hypothesis, it comes very close to it. And assuming our hypothesis to be correct, and that two different volleys were fired, I would defy anyone in Millican's position, able to distinguish eight separate shots, to be also able to determine the source of each in the order in which they were fired, particularly if he were taken by surprise.

Now let us look at the witnesses in group C, those near the front of the Depository. We would expect some of these to be able to locate the shots coming from the knoll, but to have difficulty in locating the others although some would undoubtedly have heard the shot from Oswald's window. This again is precisely what we find. Out of twenty, ten said that the shots came from the knoll, four said that they came from the Depository, one from the Courthouse, and five had no opinion. We would also expect to find that the first volley had sounded like one shot but that the second had sounded like two. In fact nineteen heard three shots, and four stated that the second and third shots were closely bunched, as did three of the witnesses in the windows above them.

We now cross the street to the group sitting around the edge of the pool on the corner. Although this is probably the most important group of all, and although, as we can see from photographs, it was a very large group, the surprising fact is that only ten people from this area gave evidence. It must be clear that these people were in the best position of all from which to observe a gunman at Oswald's window. He would not have been more than 120 feet away from them, and they would have been able, if not after the first, certainly after the second shot, to have identified the source of the shots. If the version given by the Warren Report were correct, then we should expect to find that the pattern of these witnesses' evidence was completely sharp and clear cut, i.e. it would show that three shots were fired from across the street and just above them. On the other hand if my hypothesis is correct, we can expect to find no clear picture emerging as

to the source of the shots, but a fairly consistent opinion that three shots were fired, with some people hearing four. What, in fact, do we find? Two said that the shots came from the knoll, three said that they came from the Depository. The other five had no opinion. The general consensus was that three shots had been fired, although some said two and others said four.

The really astonishing thing is that only two people at this corner out of at least thirty who were there, as we can see from frame 166 of Zapruder's film, actually saw a gunman at the window. One of these was a steamfitter called Howard Brennan and the other was a fifteen year old negro boy called Amos Euins, who immediately he saw the gunman dived, terrified, beneath a park bench. He said that he was under the impression four shots had been fired. Brennan was the Commission's star witness and it relied entirely upon his evidence to place Oswald in that window. Let me quote the exact words of the Report concerning Brennan's evidence, and let the reader decide for himself whether it fits my version of the event or that of the Warren Commission.

While waiting about 7 minutes for the President to arrive, he observed the crowd on the street and the people at the windows of the Depository Building. He noticed a man at the southeast corner window of the sixth floor, and observed him leave the window 'a couple of times'.

Brennan watched the President's car as it turned the corner at Houston and Elm and moved down the incline toward the Triple Underpass. Soon after the President's car passed, he heard an explosion like the backfire of a motorcycle. Brennan recalled:

Well, then something, just right after this explosion, made me think that it was a firecracker being thrown from the Texas Book Store. And I glanced up. And this man that I saw previously was aiming for his last shot. Well, as it appeared to me he was standing up and resting against the left window sill, with gun shouldered

to his right shoulder, holding the gun with the left hand and taking positive aim and fired his last shot. As I calculate a couple of seconds. He drew the gun back from the window as though he was drawing it back to his side and maybe paused for another second. . . and then he disappeared.

Brennan stated that he saw 70 to 85 per cent of the gun when it was fired and the body of the man from the waist up. The rifle was aimed southwesterly down Elm Street toward the underpass. Brennan saw the man fire one shot and he remembered hearing a total of only two shots. When questioned about the number of shots, Brennan testified:

I don't know what made me think that there was firecrackers throwed out of the Book Store unless I did hear the second shot, because I positively thought the first shot was a backfire, and subconsciously I must have heard a second shot, but I do not recall it. I could not swear to it.*

And now look at these revealing words from Euins' testimony: 'When the first shot was fired, I started looking around thinking it was a backfire. Everybody else started looking around.' But where were they all looking? Obviously not up at Oswald's window. The only other person from this group to look up at that window was Brennan.

Now let us examine the testimony of Robert H. Jackson, a newspaper photographer travelling in a car on Houston halfway between Main and Elm. The Report says: 'Jackson heard the first shot. As someone in the car commented that it sounded like a firecracker, Jackson heard two more shots.' His testimony makes it quite clear that the second two shots were closely bunched, and he goes on to say: 'After the last

* When confronted with Oswald later that same day at a line-up, Brennan failed to identify him. Later, when questioned by the Commission Brennan admitted that he had seen neither the recoil nor the flash of the gun. Euins told a policeman and a newspaperman within minutes of the shooting that the man he had seen was a negro. He was not asked to identify Oswald at a line-up.

shot, I guess all of us were just looking all around and I just looked up straight ahead of me. . . and I saw a rifle or what looked like a rifle. . . it was drawn fairly slowly back into the building.' In the car with Jackson was another news photographer called Dillard, and two television newsreel cameramen. To use Dillard's words, actually quoted in the Warren Report, he and his fellow passengers 'had an absolutely perfect view of the School Depository from our position in the open car.'

Can anyone imagine two television newsreel cameramen missing a scoop such as actually filming an assassin firing at the President of the United States? How could they possibly have missed it? Was it because, as Jackson stated, they didn't realise it was gun fire until after the last shot? Or was it because their ears were for some reason, (we are not talking about one man but four different news photographers) unable to pick up the source of the shots? If the Warren Report were true, this just could not have happened.

There is one other startling possibility. Perhaps it did not happen. Perhaps they did film the Book Depository and perhaps their pictures did show someone at Oswald's window, someone who was clearly not Oswald but a man in his early thirties, as Brennan described him. Would this explain why the pictures taken by these cameramen have never been shown? Oh! yes, the picture that Dillard took a few seconds later has been published everywhere but it shows nothing at all, not even the negroes whom the Report insists were at the window below.*

Before leaving Brennan's corner of the road, let us just take a look at the car that was passing him at that moment. In it sat the Mayor of Dallas, Mr. Earle Cabell, and his wife. Mrs. Cabell was in the back seat and she had just turned to her right to face Mr. Ray Roberts sitting next to her, and the Depository. As soon as she heard the first shot she looked up and saw something sticking out of Oswald's window. She

* It is perfectly true that an enlargement of a part of this photograph was printed in the Report, and that it does show three negroes in these windows. However it is such an obvious fake, that it is not worth discussing here.

then turned to her husband and told him that the first noise was a shot (apparently there was some doubt). 'Just as I got the words out the second two shots rang out.' Neither Earle Cabell nor his wife looked up at the window again. It is perfectly clear then that the Cabells heard the second two shots ring out almost simultaneously and that they were aware that at least one of them came from a totally different source.

The last group that we shall examine consists of eight witnesses standing on the corner just across Houston Street. Like those in group C, they had an unobstructed line to the knoll, and sure enough three of the eight heard shots from that direction. One heard a shot from the Depository and the other four had no opinion. James Crawford, who was a member of this group, heard a loud report which he thought was a backfire coming from the direction of the triple underpass. He heard a second shot seconds later, followed quickly by a third.

We have thus reviewed the evidence of almost every witness who watched the procession. In the main, it fits in with and in no way conflicts with my general hypothesis. The most revealing evidence comes from those standing outside the circle of fire, but they were still too close for their evidence to have really definitive value. As I have said, many were not interviewed until months after the event, and in many cases their closeness to the origin of the shots would have sown confusion in their minds. Nonetheless, I believe that I have found a pattern in all this testimony and that it points unmistakably to the conclusion that my hypothesis is correct. To clinch the argument, all we need is at least one witness who was standing sufficiently far from the source of the shots to be able to distinguish each shot from the others, and whose testimony was given while it was still fresh in his mind.

Fortunately, such a witness does exist. Mr. J. C. Price was standing on the roof of the Terminal Annex Building which faces the Book Depository on the south side of Dealey Plaza, and he was questioned on the day of the event. Price stated that he heard six shots, an initial *volley* of five shots and five

minutes later a sixth shot. As Kennedy would have been at the hospital five minutes later this can of course only be a misprint, since he must have meant seconds. The fact that he was clearly able to distinguish five shots in the first volley proves that they must all have come from different points where as it is entirely possible that he was equidistant from the two or three shots fired in the second volley.*

Other distant witnesses, who did not have the same unobstructed line to the source of each shot, would be likely to have heard variations of the same theme. John J. Solan was standing at the entrance to the Old Courthouse and he heard 'A fast shot, pause: two shots; then echoes of shots.' A Mr. Yates, who was in the middle of the road at the corner of Houston and Main, heard 'What sounded like three fire-crackers which might have been thrown off the overpass.'

The very confusion of the testimony is to my mind proof of what happened. Had there only been three shots and had they all come from the same window, one would have found the pattern in this aural evidence pointing clearly in that direction. I submit that it points in a totally different direction. And perhaps readers can now understand how Zapruder was so easily persuaded that he did not really know where the shots had come from.

* The man in the manhole could well have had a silencer fitted to his revolver.




Fig.: 1

If shots were fired simultaneously from each of the six positions marked on the perimeter of the circle, a witness at A, the centre of the circle, would hear only one report. A bystander at B, on the other hand, if he had exceptional hearing, would hear three reports.




Fig.: 2

If shots were fired simultaneously from each of the six positions shown in this diagram, anyone standing in or near the shaded area would be likely to hear something like a fire-cracker or backfire. The two snipers whose positions are circled are firing from a considerable height above ground. Nobody in the shaded area could possibly hear a single sharp report. On the other hand, a bystander well outside the circle would probably be able to distinguish five or six different shots.




Fig.: 3

This map shows the northern half of Dealey Plaza with Elm Street running from the northeast corner down to the Triple Underpass. The positions of the witnesses who gave testimony are shown by black dots or circles. Circles represent those who heard three shots of which the last two were closely bunched. Probable positions of the snipers are shown by

crosses. Kennedy's position at the moment of the first volley is shown by the Figure 1, and at the moment of the second volley by the Figure 2. The length of Elm Street is little more than 130 yards. Zapruder's position is represented by a dot at the left-hand end of the Arcade steps. With the exception of the lead car, those travelling in the procession are shown in the position they occupied at the moment of the first volley.

Covering up the Tracks

Summing up -

The conspiracy to kill President Kennedy sprang from a gradually developing consensus of (mostly, though not exclusively) Texas political figures, Big Businessmen, rightwing extremists and key elements of the Dallas power elite, with the *CIA* in it at all levels as the connecting and cementing link.

Three levels of operation can be distinguished. At the top or control level were men consumed by ambition and the thirst for power; at the intermediate or command level, *CIA* men and high police officers guided the course of events. And at the lowest or operative level, experienced marksmen, recruited from the ranks of the Minutemen and Cuban adventurers, trained and equipped by the *CIA*, carried out the assassination.

Apart from the obvious overall purpose of ending the Kennedy Administration and opening a new era, prime factors in the conspiracy were the desire to effect a radical change in foreign policy (in particular towards Cuba and in Vietnam) and to preserve specific Texas interests such as the tax privileges enjoyed by the oil industry.

All these aims were attained. Cuba was further isolated through the establishment, with the help of the *CIA*, of military dictatorships throughout Latin America. The war in Vietnam - which Kennedy had meant to liquidate at the earliest possible moment - was escalated, step by step, into the senseless mass slaughter in progress at the end of 1967. And the oil industry has never had it so good.

The crime was conceived and executed with consummate skill. As political assassinations go, it was near-perfect - and the Warren Commission remedied any imperfections.

The way the masterminds behind the conspiracy prepared to, and effectively did cover their tracks must command the

respect of all devotees of detective fiction from Edgar Allen Poe to James Bond.

A key element in this coverup was the framing of Lee Harvey Oswald for both the assassination and the killing of Patrolman J. D. Tippit.

Frameups are common practice in America, but rarely are they accomplished with such minute preparation and elaborate technique as in this case. The conception of a False Oswald incriminating the real one in advance beyond hope by scattering prepared clues against him well ahead of the crime, was a master stroke attributable (I believe) to the evil genius of David Ferrie.

Likewise, the way the Mafia plot against Governor Connally was taken out of Ruby's hands and converted into a Presidential assassination shows a true mastermind at work, even though many details of this operation still remain obscure.

In other ways, too, the coverup technique is impressive. I have always considered the *CIA* rather incompetent in its proper domain, foreign intelligence, but at least the Agency now has demonstrated its skill in carrying out a *coup d'état* at home.

Indeed, I doubt if there has ever been a case of comparable importance in which so many red herrings were drawn across so many trails; so many smokescreens put up to hide so much from sight; or so much tear gas squirted into so many eyes.

Nor was there ever a case in which so much tampering with the material evidence, officially inspired or officially condoned, occurred; or such wide use was made in the press of faked or doctored photographs; or so much bullying and badgering of witnesses took place; or so much of their testimony was twisted and distorted; or so many of them were killed in quick succession.*

And, surely, never before in all the history of crime have there been so many accessories after the fact.

* To the impressive total of more than 20 slain witnesses previously known, Garrison, in the Playboy interview, has added three more.

Little more needs to be said about the Warren Commission. Every intelligent person with an open mind who has really studied the case will agree, I believe, with this statement made by Jim Garrison in September 4, 1967:

'... the conclusions of the Warren Commission are so far from the truth that they constitute a gigantic fraud - quite possibly the largest in terms of effort and scope and effect ever perpetrated on the planet.'

Yes, a gigantic fraud. Perpetrated by a Presidential Commission investigating the assassination of a President of the United States.

This case once more exemplifies the terrible truth of Lord Acton's famous dictum: 'All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.' The power of Washington may not be absolute, but it is enormous. And the Kennedy Murder Fraud offers an accurate yardstick of its corruption.

Not the least shameful aspect of the case is the failure, or rather the demonstrable unwillingness of the press to do anything about this gigantic fraud.

It is the elementary duty of a free press worthy of that name to expose corruption and to check the raw misuse of power. Yet not a single newspaper, news magazine or general magazine of major importance ever lifted a finger to help expose the Kennedy Murder Fraud. And scores of them threw their whole weight into the battle to help prevent the truth from coming out.

The American press, of course, is most to blame, but a large segment of the world press blindly followed its lead through thick and thin, as it so often does, no matter how big the lie or how depraved the cause. The first major publication to back a call for the reopening of the case was the *Saturday Evening Post* on November 21, 1967, four years after the assassination.

What worries Garrison is that America is in danger of becoming a proto-fascist State. He believes, as he pointed out to his *Playboy* interviewer, that the clever manipulation of the mass media is one of the key factors in this development. By thus creating a 'concentration camp of the mind', he thinks that the Government of the United States has

discovered the most effective means ever devised for keeping the populace in order.

It was in that concentration camp that President John F. Kennedy was slain.

Postscript

Reviewing my book *Oswald: The Truth* in the *Sunday Times* of July 23, 1967, Cyril Connolly described me as an 'embittered and pugnacious polemicist, the equivalent of a hard-boiled Baconian' and notes that I seem to be 'in a perpetual state of indignation'. He also chides me because 'no suspicion is too base for him to harbour'.

Yet at the end of his review, Mr. Connolly concedes that *Oswald: The Truth* had left him 'with a general feeling that there has been falsification and covering up on a grand scale'.

Is that not reason enough for indignation? Or for harbouring some 'base suspicions'?

Appendix

Open Letter to Governor Ronald Reagan of California
by Joachim Joesten

Dear Governor Reagan:

Why don't you go along with the sensible suggestion to run for Vice President on a Rockefeller ticket?

Then, after selection, all you'd have to do is to invite President Rockefeller to your territory, and ambush and kill him there, say in Los Angeles or San Francisco (the local police might be of some help).

That would make you President - and wouldn't that be nice?

With all best wishes for success,

Very truly yours,

Joachim Joesten

October 7, 1967

State of California
Governor's Office

Dear Mr. Joesten:

Thank you for taking the time and trouble to write Governor Reagan and express your interest in the 1968 presidential elections. Governor Reagan appreciates your comments.

However, the Governor has asked me to reiterate what he has said on many occasions - he is not a candidate for President or for any other national office.

October 18, 1967

Sincerely,

William P. Clark Jr.
Executive Secretary